DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 463 IR 008 712

TITLE	Interorganizational Arrangements for Collaborative Efforts: Literature Review.
INSTITUTION	Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	29 Feb 80
CONTRACT	NIE-R-79-0029
NOTE	100p.; For related documents, see IR 008 710-714.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Cooperation; *Educational Improvement; Educational Research; *Educational Resources; Federal Programs; Grants; Improvement Programs; *Information Dissemination

ABSTRACT

This literature review examines four conceptual areas: (1) interorganizational collaboration; (2) the use of intermediary agencies; (3) the improvement of educational practice; and (4) the increase of educational equity. A focused review of the conceptual issue, a bibliography including research and literature citations, and abstracts of the most relevant writings are provided for each area. The literature suggests that there is a general mandate for collaboration and a widespread consensus that it is imperative for institutions in our society to collaborate in order to maximize the utilization of limited resources; it also indicates pitfalls to be considered when collaboration is undertaken and offers strong arguments for regarding intermediaries as critical linking mechanisms for achieving effective collaboration. Rather than an exhaustive study of the literature, this monograph represents a targeted inquiry and is suggestive of the kinds of literature reviews which may be needed in the future. (Author/RAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191463

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Interorganizational Arrangements For Collaborative Efforts

LITERATURE REVIEW

Prepared by:

Dissemination Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
710 S. W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

for the:

Regional Program
Program for Dissemination and Improvement of Practice
National Institute of Education

February 29, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Margaret Thorne

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR008712

JUN 20 1980

The work on which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. NIE-R-79-0029 of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	v
Overview	vii
Acknowledgements	ix
INTERORGANIZATIONAL COLLABORATION	1
Review of Literature	3
Bibliography	15
Abstracts	17
Collaboration for Urban Education in Chicago: The Woodlawn Developmental Project, Willard J. Congreve	17
An Executive Director's Struggle to Actualize his Commitment to Collaboration, David P. Crandall	18
Interorganizational Relations: Problems in the Design and Implementation of the Research and Development Exchange, Neal Gross and Charles Mojkowski	19
Collaboration Among Schools and Business and Industry: An Analysis of the Problems and Some Suggestions for Improving the Process, Susan Rath and Rex Hagans	20
Changing Urban Bureaucracies: How New Practices Become Routinized, Robert K. Yin	21
USING INTERMEDIARY AGENCIES	23
Review of Literature	25
Bibliography	41
Abstracts	43
Professional Associations as Intermediaries in Transferring Technology to City Governments, Richard Bingham, et al.	43

Page

The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change, Robert E. Herriott and Neal Gross 44

Grease the Squeaky Wheel: A Report on the Implementation of Title V of the ESEA, Jerome Murphy 45

IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE. 47

Review of Literature 49

Bibliography. 65

Abstracts 67

The Appropriateness of Adaptation in the Transfer of Innovations, Robert J. Calsyn, Louis G. Tarnatzky and Susan Dittmar. . 67

Educational Innovation in the United States, Ronald Havelock and Mary C. Havelock. 68

The Use of Social Research to Improve Social Practice, Ronald Lippitt. 69

The Organizational Change Study: A Conceptualization of Planned Organizational Change, Sheila Rosenblum. 70

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY. 71

Review of Literature. 73

Bibliography. 87

Abstracts 89

Equal Educational Opportunity: Ideal or Ideology?, Nicholas C. Burbules and Ann L. Sherman 89

Equity, Equal Opportunity and Education, Nicholas C. Burbules, Ann L. Sherman and Brian Lord . . . 90

The Information Poor in America, Thomas Childers and Joyce Post. 91

Information Equity in the Field of Education: A Concept Paper, Glen Harvey 92

Keyes v. School District Number One: A Constitutional Right to Equal Educational Opportunity?, Peter B. Kutner 93

FOREWORD

The materials in this document are part of a larger collection of reports prepared by the Dissemination Program of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. They were produced as a result of a contract awarded by the Regional Program (RP) of the National Institute of Education (NIE), Program for the Dissemination and Improvement of Practice. The Regional Program stimulates and supports mechanisms for improving educational practice and equity through regional approaches. It emphasizes interagency collaboration among decision makers in regions, states, local school districts, regional laboratories, R&D centers, colleges and universities and other educational organizations.

The Regional Program has developed a plan that calls for a set of activities designed to focus organizational resources and capacities on NIE's two goals of improving practice and increasing equity in schools. A major component of the plan is a program that will fund a variety of organizations working in collaboration to undertake promising approaches to practice improvement. The activities carried out by NWREL were designed to provide information and thinking that would be used by Regional Program staff in designing this funding program.

Under the NWREL contract, two seminars were held where RP staff and selected practitioners together explored the issues related to organizational collaboration for practice improvement. This resulted in the volume titled Seminar Proceedings.

Work was also done to provide a basis from research and from other literature for further consideration of Regional Program issues. This resulted in two volumes titled Commissioned Papers and Literature Review.

The contract also resulted in a compilation of information about existing interorganizational arrangements for improving educational practice. This resulted in the volume titled Project Studies. The fifth volume attempts to derive and pull together implications and conclusions from all of these activities and is titled Final Report.

Each of the activities conducted by NWREL was designed to explore four issues that the Regional Program believed were key to planning the new program. These issues were expressed as a series of questions related to the outcomes of improvement of practice and increased equity, through the strategy of supporting alternative forms of interorganizational collaboration and to the mechanism of working through intermediaries. Although these and other relevant questions have not been answered fully, a major step has been taken through this "collaborative efforts" project. This document is made available to you for your own use and to help the Regional Program further understand and clarify issues related to these general topics. We would appreciate your reactions to this document and to the others in this series. Your comments will assist us as we continue to develop and improve the Regional Program. Thank you for your help.

David P. Mack, Regional Program
Team Leader for Development
National Institute of Education

W. E. Ellis, Assistant Director for
Regional Program
National Institute of Education

OVERVIEW

In order to expand the knowledge base on some of the complex issues confronting Regional Program staff, the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) conducted a search of the literature across the four conceptual areas of:

1. Interorganizational collaboration
2. The use of intermediary agencies
3. The improvement of educational practice
4. The increase of educational equity

A review of the literature in each of the four areas was prepared. Development of these reviews consisted of a three-part process:

1. Preparation of a bibliography which included the research and literature citations for each of the above mentioned conceptual areas. The most important criterion for including citations was the extent to which they were relevant to the stated mission, program and planning needs of the Regional Program
2. Preparation of abstracts of the most relevant writings in each of the topical areas
3. Preparation of a focused review of the literature for each of the conceptual issues

Review of the literature suggests that there is a general mandate for collaboration and a widespread consensus that it is imperative for institutions in our society to collaborate in order to maximize the utilization of limited resources. There are, however, as the literature indicates, many potential pitfalls to consider when collaboration is undertaken.

The literature also offers strong arguments for regarding intermediaries as critical linking mechanisms for achieving effective collaboration. Intermediate agencies are seen as logical units for

supporting educational improvement and change, but writers are emphatic about the need for these units to pursue careful planning processes.

Improving practice--any practice--is difficult to define, to plan for or to document. While it is commonly assumed that the vitality of a particular field or organization is largely dependent upon its ability to adopt new innovations and to change to meet internal needs and external demands, a vast array of methods are used to achieve these ends. Complex questions remain unanswered: who determines what needs to be improved? Who decides how it will be improved? How should the degree of improvement be evaluated?

The mission of providing for greater educational equity is even more complex than the issues of improving practice. The issues are historic, the demands intense and the definitions vague. Although equal educational opportunity is unlikely to become a reality in the near future, it is nevertheless a widely accepted goal of educational policy.

This monograph does not represent an exhaustive study of the literature in these four areas. It is, rather, the result of a very targeted inquiry and is suggestive of the kinds of literature reviews which may be needed in the future.

Virginia Thompson, Director
Dissemination Program
Northwest Regional Educational
Laboratory

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Of the many individuals who participated in the preparation of these reviews, special recognition is due to two groups of people.

First, there are those who assumed direct, primary responsibility for conducting the research, reviewing the literature and preparing focused review documents. The four conceptual issues covered in these reviews--collaboration, intermediaries, improvement of practice and equity--are complex and illusive. These factors, plus the compressed timelines and difficulty experienced by the researchers and writers in accessing documents, makes their fine work especially worthy of acknowledgement.

Second, many other staff members of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory have contributed significantly to the preparation of this document. In addition to staff members within the Dissemination Program who coordinated the overall process of the focused reviews, people in other support units of the Laboratory assisted in the many tasks involved in the production of the monograph.

The immeasurable contributions of all of these individuals is gratefully acknowledged.

Interorganizational Collaboration

There is in the literature a general mandate for collaboration and a general consensus that it is an imperative for institutions in our society, including schools, in order to maintain quality programs, maximize limited resources and avoid wasteful and inefficient duplication of services.

Key Points: The tasks involved in collaboration are **highly demanding and complex.**

Pitfalls to collaboration include:

- Tendency to be **overly ambitious**; more is promised than can be delivered
- Tendency to **underestimate time required**
- Effective and thorough planning is overlooked
- **Loss of organizational autonomy** and **program visibility**

Collaboration is **no panacea** to arriving at quality decisions or to implementing high calibre projects.

Collaborative success will occur **only if potential barriers and requirements** are **clearly understood.**

Very little is actually understood about how to establish and maintain collaborative relationships.

Collaboratives may include **resource sharing, group problem solving,** program **development and service delivery.**

Communications and integration mechanisms may range from ad hoc **advisory groups** with little power to **governing boards** with the power to set priorities and allocate resources.

Shared decision making is a feature of a true collaboration.

Equal participation, voluntary participation, interdependence and common understanding are important.

Collaboration needs to **benefit individual organizations,** as well as the group as a whole.

An **initiating organization** may be **seen as a threat.**

Participants must have potential for **meaningful commitment and followthrough.**

Internal struggles and instability in a participating agency **weaken a collaborative.**

It is important to **begin with** a **visible accomplishment.**

Collaboratives must have clear **intent,** arrive at a **division of labor,** allow **clear rewards** and establish **perimeters** for activities.

Highly **competent leadership** and **participants** who are **not** already **overloaded** are important.

Internal struggles and instability in a participating agency **weaken a collaborative.**

It is important to **begin with a visible accomplishment.**

Collaboratives must have a clear **intent,** arrive at a **division of labor,** allow **clear rewards** and establish **perimeters** for activities.

Highly **competent leadership and participants** who are **not** already **overloaded** are important.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Rationale for Collaboration

Considerable encouragement exists in educational literature for collaborative associations, joint problem solving and interorganizational resource sharing. Similarly, in medicine, mental health and community services, concern with successful cooperative program planning and service delivery is a very real and reoccurring issue. As Bertram Brown, former director of the National Institute of Mental Health commented, there is a powerful momentum to increase efficiency in the human services and to provide for the most effective use of resources available. For many other policymakers, researchers and program administrators, collaborative agreements between agencies, organizations and institutions offer the only probable solution to the problems of increasing service needs, decreasing budgets and current frustrations with piecemeal and inadequate approaches to complex problems. There is in the literature, then, a general mandate for collaboration and a general consensus that it is an imperative for institutions in our society, including schools, in order to maintain quality programs, maximize limited resources and avoid wasteful and inefficient duplication of services.

However, despite common agreement on the real need for organizational and institutional collaboration, there are few documentors of, or participants in, the process who do not openly recognize the demands and complexities of the task. As one federal policymaker acknowledges in commenting on collaboration among a federal institute, an R&D center and a school district, "Collaboration is tough but needed. It takes patience and time to build it and still maintain reasonable productivity." (Brown, 1977) Other writers on collaboration point to a multitude of

potential pitfalls that increase the inherent difficulty in establishing collaborative arrangements. These include the all too frequent tendency to be overly ambitious and promise more than can be delivered or to vastly underestimate the time it will take. (Gross, 1977) Others note that it is unrealistic to expect cooperation to solve all problems and that individuals frequently underestimate the time and energy that needs to be expended to make a collaborative work. (Jacobsen, 1973; Parrucci, 1977) Moreover, effective and thorough planning may be the most critical--and often most overlooked--ingredient in any successful joint interorganizational venture. (Gross, 1977) Program developers in the area of human service integration similarly note that although integration of services can increase the efficiency and resource availability of providers, many groups will fight integration because it may mean a loss of organizational autonomy and program visibility. (Kelty, 1976)

These words of caution and identification of potential obstacles existing in interorganization collaboration are included in this introduction to provide a more balanced perspective on the demands involved in the collaborative effort. As one author noted, "Collaboration is by no means a panacea to arriving at quality decisions or to implementing high calibre projects." (Crandall, 1977) Despite this, most authors continue to agree that carefully planned and structured interorganizational efforts offer one of the most effective methods of identifying and implementing programs that are more comprehensive and inclusive in scope than could be developed or undertaken by any single agency or institution.

Although collaborative efforts in education and other human services hold rich potential rewards, the more relevant current literature cautions that collaborative success will occur only if we clearly understand the

potential barriers and the requirements for successful ventures. The literature also acknowledges that we have just begun to pay attention to the nature and characteristics of the collaborative process. As Hall and Hord appropriately comment, ". . . not all collaborative relationships are the same; as a matter of fact, very little is understood about how to establish and maintain working collaborative relationships between formal organizations." (Hall and Hord, 1977)

The purpose of this paper, then, is to determine what promotes successful collaboration, and what pitfalls interfere with its occurence. From this analysis and discussion, it should be possible to move one step closer to understanding when collaborative approaches may be advantageous and what kinds of personal and organizational requirements are called for to make them work.

In preparing this review of the literature, some of the questions used to guide the analysis of collaboration included:

- What is meant by collaboration?
- What kinds of collaborative arrangements exist?
- What are the requirements for successful collaboration to occur?
- What barriers inhibit collaboration?
- What incentives foster collaboration?

Examples of successful collaborative efforts were sought in education, medicine, mental health and the social sciences. Drawing on experiences in multiple disciplines was an attempt to arrive at a more varied approach to determining when and how collaboration offers resolutions to inter-organizational problems. In doing so, however, the underlying purpose is to increase understanding of how collaborative efforts can work to improve education.

Defining and Describing Collaboration

The literature on collaboration describes a considerable array of interorganizational efforts involving resource sharing, group problem solving, program development and service delivery. Organizations have applied collaborative frameworks in various settings to carry out a range of functions including: planning more effective interagency staff development; developing intercollegiate resource sharing and inter-institutional curriculum arrangements; involving business and industry in preparing students for the work place; incorporating community organizations in efforts to improve the schools; and integrating and coordinating community social service agencies to provide centralized referral and followup.

More frequently than not, the term collaboration is used interchangeably with the terms cooperative, consortia, alliance and service integration. This illustrates the wide range of parameters in collaborative efforts and the continuum that exists between collaborations emphasizing communication and those focusing on program integration. One author illustrates this by noting that organizational arrangements may vary from ad hoc advisory groups with little power to governing boards with the ability to set priorities and affect the allocation of resources. (Mittenthal, 1976) For the purposes of this paper, however, interorganizational collaboration is viewed as distinct from organizational cooperation. As is aptly pointed out in a paper on collaboration between schools and business and industry, cooperative associations involve institutions serving together in an advisory capacity. Collaborative groups, on the other hand, involve organizations participating in shared decision making, where negotiation becomes the central process in working together. (Rath, 1978) A description of collaboration in the health

services further identifies important aspects of the process. It specifies mutual determining of service delivery needs and priorities, carrying out joint programming and coordinating and centralizing agency functions such as client intake and followup. (Parrucci, 1977) These descriptions indicate that collaboration involves interagency communication, mutual determination of priorities, shared decision making and the development of an action plan that requires active participation from the organizations involved. In other words the group itself has power to take action and through specific agreements to arrive at a modification of the existing organizational commitments of participating institutions.

Crandall contributes further to a definition of collaboration by commenting that it is:

> . . . the process of working together to solve problems and act on the solution under circumstances where all parties believe that a mutually agreeable solution is possible and that the quality of its implementation, as well as the level of satisfaction they will experience, will be improved by virtue of engaging in the process. (Crandall, 1977)

In this definition the author emphasizes group problem solving and program implementation which can be arrived at in a mutually advantageous manner allowing all participants to benefit equally and devise outcomes that are superior to those of any single individual or organization operating on its own.

In an AERA paper on "The State Capacity Building Grants Program in Dissemination: The Federal Evaluation Perspective," Mary Ann Millsap further delineates some of the important characteristics of collaboration:

1. Each party's decision to become involved in the joint venture results from choice; participation is voluntary.

2. All parties have an equal stake in the activities undertaken, usually involving the contribution of equal amounts of money, time and effort.

3. All parties have an equal stake in the consequences of the activities, whether good or ill.

4. Within the process of collaboration, decision making is shared, or each party has veto power over what is undertaken.

5. Each party is dependent upon the others for the accomplishment of the work--that each, on its own, could not accomplish.

6. Lastly there is a common understanding of expectations of what each party is to do, including knowledge of the constraints or limitations under which each party is operating. (Millsap in Rath, 1978)

Millsap's characteristics of collaboration emphasize voluntary participation; equal participation in decision making, in assuming responsibilities, and in sharing work assignments; interdependence and personal interaction; and common understanding of obligations and constraints. Other authors stress that collaboration must involve an organized effort with clearly defined plans for substantive action which elicit mutual involvement from all participants. (Barton) Collaboration also calls for a willingness among institutions to submerge some of their own self-interests to accomplish larger goals (Rath, 1978), as well as a mutual belief that collaboration will result in benefits to individual organizations as well as the group as a whole.

The definitions and descriptions of collaborative efforts illustrate the key features or characteristics of collaboration that are emphasized in the literature. These include:

- Active, working partnerships among individuals and organizations
- Shared responsibility and authority for policymaking
- Equal investment and benefits for participants
- Common understanding of expectations, responsibilities and constraints
- Interdependence in carrying out activities
- Organized format for communicating and planning
- Shared information and development of a common plan of action

A Perspective on Barriers to Collaboration

In the introduction to this paper we referred to a few of the difficulties involved in carrying out successful collaborative arrangements. This section takes a closer and more detailed look at some of these issues in an effort to understand the process of collaboration and where current attempts may be falling short.

According to current authors, one of the most prevalent problem areas for those undertaking collaborative efforts is a failure to recognize the high level of demand collaboration places on participating individuals and organizations. At the onset most initiators are spurred on by an abstract vision of improved service, increased efficiency and better utilization of resources. In light of these potential assets, few organizations or individuals take a hard, critical and evaluative look at what can realistically be accomplished, how much time it will take, and what resources, both human and financial, are available for the task. (Gross, 1977; Crandall, 1977) Moreover, the absence of clear parameters and realistic objectives for the collaboration increases the possibility that the initiating organization will be perceived as a threat and forced to spend a major portion of time convincing participants of the need for the project rather than focusing on accomplishing tasks. (Parrucci, 1977)

Consequently, those experienced in developing organizational collaborations note that initiating collaboration on an ad hoc basis without careful forethought, planning and selection of participants can bring about immediate and far reaching difficulties.

A second potential problem area is attempting to collaborate with institutions and organizations without giving careful consideration to

ground rules. Organizations with potentially conflicting agendas and differing goals and objectives must be assured that decisions will be arrived at by consensus and not coercion, and that all organizations will have equal power. Consequently, authors on collaboration related internal group divisiveness to the failure to determine how conflicts will be resolved, the absence of skilled mediators and the inability to confront differences and disagreements openly. As one documentor commented, although resolving differences can be constructive and lead to formulating new ideas and new relationships, these resolutions often result in revealing new differences which call for additional negotiation and problem solving. (Congreve, 1969)

Finally, the probability of successful collaboration is diminished if institutions fail to identify participants that have the potential for meaningful commitment and followthrough. If organizations lack internal stability, strong, competent leadership, and are focused on internal power struggles rather than external activity, the chances of coordinating a collaborative undertaking are minimized. (Gross, 1977; Hall and Hord, 1977; Rath, 1978) As Hall and Hord point out in a discussion on collaboration involving an R&D center and two school districts, collaborative activities are impeded by organizations that are focused on internal concerns and unresolved power struggles. (Hall and Hord, 1977) Other authors note that if support for the collaborative activities is lacking, or if the organization is saddled with regulations and restrictions, followthrough for the collaborative effort is indeed unlikely. (Crandall, 1977; Gross, 1977)

In summary, then, some of the issues identified in the literature that impede collaborative efforts include:

1. Confusion about what is possible and what is desired from the activity.

2. Unwillingness to take time to plan and organize the effort.

3. Failure to establish operating procedures that ensure equal power and participation.

4. Inadequate negotiating skills among participants.

5. Selection of organizations that are unlikely to be able to carry through an activity.

Considerations for Successful Collaboration

Only a limited number of the studies on collaboration analyze the collaborative process and identify factors critical to the success of these activities. The three authors selected, however, give a range of perspectives on the variety of forces that affect interorganizational collaboration and the issues that foster collaborative arrangements.

In a description of collaboration among a university, a school district and a community organization, which was formed to improve urban education, Willard Congreve outlines some of the critical tasks used to build group commitment and solidarity. At the outset of the effort this group successfully challenged a proposal for their activities rejected by USOE. Success in acquiring funding provided a tangible and clearcut reward for the group and resulted in an impetus for further collaborative action. Other important experiences in the collaborative process included:

1. Establishing group ground rules which required concurrent approval of all three institutions for all decisions, equal representation from each group and rotating chairman.

2. Defining the general purpose of the group and coming to terms with clear differences on certain goals and accommodating these differences.

3. Carrying out a group task which involved assessing educational needs and problems in the district.

4. Developing a plan to address these educational needs and acquiring approval for an experimental program.

Congreve stresses the importance of having the group deal with real issues: "Without issues the board members cannot create mechanisms necessary to convert differences into collaborative relationships." He also documents the importance of beginning with a visible accomplishment, developing activities for real participation for members, and concluding with a plan that could make a real difference in the educational delivery of services.

Two other papers, one by David Crandall and the other by Neal Gross and Charles Mojkowski, also provide useful insights into some of the broader personal and organizational issues in collaboration. Crandall, in his personal perspective on the challenges of being involved in a collaborative organization, makes some incisive points about requirements for effective collaboration. Collaboration, he notes, seems to work most easily when the tasks are rather straightforward, but not so easily when they are highly complex. Moreover, for success, the participants must believe that they and their organizations can achieve their most important goals.

Crandall also focuses on some of the important intraorganizational characteristics in collaboration which include a need for:

1. A reservoir of personal energy available to promote and sustain progress during setbacks and conflicts.
2. A level of organizational stability which encourages a "freedom to risk."
3. Commitment of individuals to the task at hand and understanding of its relation to the organizational mission.
4. A wide repertoire of systematic problem solving skills.
5. Advocates in the organization supporting collaboration.

Finally, Gross and Mojkowski provide a thorough assessment of problems in interorganizational relations that may interfere with effective collaborative efforts. They note that organizational role definition

and staff competency are of major importance. More specifically, an organization initiating collaboration must clearly state its intent, arrive at a specific division of labor among agencies, allow for clear rewards and benefits from the commitment, and establish realistic and mutually useful parameters for its activities. Gross and Mojkowski also call for realistic planning of collaborative efforts, including careful staging or sequencing of tasks and anticipation of barriers. The authors caution against making unrealistic promises and state, ". . . it does not take long for participants to realize that they have become involved in a collaborative activity that will draw upon their limited resources but has little possibility of achieving its stated objectives." To be successful, moreover, collaboration calls for highly competent leadership, participants that are not already experiencing role overload, and ability to give the effort priority status within the context of the organization. Gross and Mojkowski also pay particular attention to the kinds of organizations that are effective in collaboratives. These include groups with organizational flexibility that are focused on external issues rather than internal problems and have competent leadership and staff with strong negotiating skills.

Implications for Future Collaborative Efforts

Institutions must pay close attention to the proposed level of collaborative involvement to be undertaken. Activities will potentially occur at three levels: the first is brokering and technical assistance; the second is policy development and advocacy; the third is coordination and management. (Ungerer in Rath, 1978) Each level requires an increasing degree of organizational and individual commitment from participants. The organizations anticipating collaborative enterprises

should be urged to critically assess their anticipated level of involvement and consider the potential benefits and liabilities involved in carrying out the collaborative venture. A number of authors caution institutions not to assume that most tasks lend themselves to collaboration. They note that some projects in fact do not warrant the psychic and economic costs of its use. Moreover, collaboration may work effectively in certain settings for planning, but be undesirable for implementation. (Crandall, 1977; Jacobsen, 1977)

The literature also clearly indicates that successful collaboration activities must have priority status in the organization and not be undertaken in a casual, ad hoc manner. Time should be allowed for planning and development, and recognition should be given to the need for collaboration to develop in graduated stages. Furthermore, acquiring skill in negotiation and cooperative decision making is vital. Doing so may necessitate technical assistance during the formative and maintenance stages of the group effort.

If collaboratives are to be effective means of resource sharing and program development, they must provide clear-cut benefits to participating institutions. This includes striking a balance between interdependency and interagency sharing, and maintaining autonomy appropriate to the needs of each institution. Attempting to undertake any tasks that will substantially reduce the independence or visibility of any single organization will increase the potential for internal resistance by participants.

Careful selection of organizations to participate in collaboration is also a vital consideration. Organizations selected should have a level of internal stability and organizational flexibility, skilled leadership, adequate staff time for participation and a recognition of the collaborative effort as an activity directly related to their organizational mission.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brown, Oliver, et al. "A Federal Institute, A University R&D Center and a School District Join Forces: The Process and Problem." Symposium at AERA, 1977.

Congreve, Willard J. "Collaboration for Urban Education in Chicago: The Woodlawn Developmental Project." Education and Urban Society, February, 1969.

Crandall, David P. "An Executive Director's Struggle to Actualize his Commitment to Collaboration." Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 13, November 3, 1977.

Fishman, Joshua A. "Problems of Research Collaboration and Cooperation." Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XXIV, No. 2, 1968.

Givens, Paul R. and Bert C. Bock. "A Model for Private-Public Cooperation in Higher Education." Liberal Education, May, 1974.

Gross, Neal and Charles Mojkowski. "Interorganizational Relations Problems in the Design and Implementation of the Research and Development Exchange." Information Dissemination and Exchanges for Educational Innovation: Conceptual and Implementation Issues of a Regionally Based Nationwide System, December, 1977.

Hall, Gene and Shirley Hord. "The Concerns-Based Perspective of the Collaboration Between an R&D Center and Two School Districts." Symposium at AERA, 1977.

Jacobsen, Julia and Jane Belcher. "Consortia: Two Models-Guides to Inter-College Cooperation." Latin American Institute, 1973.

Kelty, Edward. "Is Services Integration Dangerous to Your Mental Health?" Evaluation and Change, Vol. 3, 1976.

Kinzer, Suzanne M. and William Drummond. "Parity and Educational Problem Solving: A Progress Report." University of Florida, undated.

Lynn, Lawrence E. "Organizing Human Services in Florida: A Study of the Public Policy Process." Evaluation and Change, 1976.

Meals, Donald. "Organizing for Improving Delivery of Educational Services in Massachusetts." Vol. 1: A Process Approach to the Development of Regional Education Delivery Systems in Massachusetts, Merrimack Education Center, 1974.

Mittenthal, Stephen. "A System Approach to Human Services Integration." Evaluation and Change, 1976.

Morril, William. "Services Integration and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare." Evaluation and Change, 1976.

Parrucci, Dennis J. "Planned Change in the Mon Valley: Implementing Services Integration at the Programmatic Level." Evaluation and Change, Vol. 4, 1977.

Rath, Susan and Rex Hagans. Collaboration Among Schools and Business and Industry: An Analysis of the Problems and Some Suggestions for Improving the Process. Paper, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1978.

Rubenstein, Julian and Sol Levin. "A Model for Interagency Cooperation in the Provision of Mental Health Services to Youths." Hospital and Community Psychiatry, June, 1976.

Salason, Susan. "Two Views on Services Integration: Bertram S. Brown and Reubin Askews." Evaluation and Change, 1976.

Twarek, Richard. "Interinstitutional Cooperation: A Working Model for Preparing New Health Care Practitioners." Journal of Medical Education, February, 1977.

Congreve, Willard, J. "Collaboration for Urban Education in Chicago: The Woodlawn Developmental Project." Education and Urban Society, February, 1969.

This article describes specific steps involved in establishing a working collaborative among a university, a school district and a community organization. The collaborative was formed to improve urban education. Its development illustrates some of the critical tasks involved in building group commitment and solidarity.

The group's initial success in acquiring funding was, according to the author, a tangible and clearcut reward that provided impetus for further action. Other important steps included: establishing mutually acceptable ground rules; specifically defining the purpose of the group and accommodating differences in goals; conducting a group assessment of educational needs and problems; and mutually developing a plan to address the problem areas identified. Congreve stresses the importance of having the group deal with real issues, not theoretical concerns. He also documents the significance of beginning with a visible accomplishment, developing activities for meaningful participation, and concluding with a plan that could make a substantial difference in the educational delivery of services.

Crandall, David P. "An Executive Director's Struggle to Actualize his Commitment to Collaboration." Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 13, November, 1977.

In this personal assessment of the challenges of being involved in a collaborative organization, Crandall makes some incisive points about requirements for effective collaboration. He comments that collaboration seems to work most easily when the tasks are rather straightforward, but not so easily when they are highly complex.

Crandall also outlines some of the important interorganizational characteristics in collaboration. These include a need for: (1) a reservoir of personal energy to sustain progress during setbacks and conflicts, (2) a level of organizational stability which encourages a "freedom to risk," (3) commitment of individuals to the task at hand and understanding of its relation to the organizational mission, (4) a wide repertoire of systematic problem solving skills and (5) advocates in the organization supporting collaboration.

Not all tasks, Crandall concludes, lend themselves to collaboration. Some projects do not warrant the psychic and economic costs of its use. Collaboration, moreover, may work effectively during certain stages of development; for example it may work well for planning, but be less desirable for implementation.

Gross, Neal and Charles Mojkowski. "Interorganizational Relations: Problems in the Design and Implementation of the Research and Development Exchange." Information Dissemination and Exchange for Educational Innovations: Conceptual and Implementation Issues of a Regionally Based Nationwide System, December, 1977.

This paper provides a thorough analysis of interorganizational problems that can interfere with establishing effective collaborative efforts. The authors assess organizational capabilities, identify potential problem areas and suggest alternatives for overcoming barriers to collaborative activity. In doing so they urge taking a hard headed and realistic assessment of the new role demands called for in collaborative efforts before engaging in them.

In determining the capacity of an organization for collaboration these issues are significant: flexibility of the organization; disposition toward innovation; the organization's stability or instability; leadership capacity and staff competence and ability to focus on external activities rather than internal problems and conflicts. Organizational effectiveness in a collaborative setting relate directly to these qualities.

The authors also point out that establishing viable interorganizational relations and minimizing threat to established agencies calls for a clear division of labor among agencies; agreed upon ground rules; a modest initial project that will validate roles of the collaborative organization; and clearcut rewards and benefits from participation.

Finally, successful collaborative ventures are often blocked by a failure to carry out comprehensive planning at the onset. This includes considering the potential barriers that may be encountered during each stage of development and preparing alternative strategies for dealing with them.

Rath, Susan and Rex Hagans. Collaboration Among Schools and Business and Industry: An Analysis of the Problems and Some Suggestions for Improving the Process. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1978.

Collaboration between education and business is currently viewed as almost a necessity. But few, contend these authors, know what collaborative efforts require or how one goes about accomplishing them. In an effort to further understand the process this paper presents some current definitions and assumptions about collaboration, assesses some of the barriers to its accomplishments and examines the relationship between collective bargaining and collaboration.

Collaboration, note the authors, is distinct from cooperation. Cooperation involves groups or individuals acting in solely an advisory capacity, while collaboration calls for them to share mutually in the decision making process and to negotiate solutions to issues of mutual concern. Collaboration is, moreover, difficult to foster. Problems such as poor communication, insufficient authority, lack of strong leadership, inability to focus on a specific project and unwillingness to share in the decision making are obstacles that frustrate many attempts to collaborate. Successful collaborative efforts, on the other hand, involve the investment of participants, shared decision making, common understanding of roles and responsibilities, effective leadership and careful planning and organization.

The second half of this paper examines the collective bargaining process and how it may serve as a basis for developing more effective methods of collaborating. To do so, contend the authors, requires that individuals develop an understanding of negotiation and acquire the prerequisite skills to use it in collaborative settings.

Yin, Robert K. Changing Urban Bureaucracies: How New Practices Become Routinized, Executive Summary. Rand Corporation, Washington, D. C., March, 1978.

In order for practice in any organization to be changed and ostensibly improved, organizations must thoroughly incorporate new activities. Yin's study provides insights into the process used by urban bureaucracies to integrate new practices into their operating procedures.

Similar to conclusions in educational studies, Yin found that internal conditions rather than external incentives (i.e., federal initiatives) have a major impact on incorporation of new practices. Specific internal conditions that proved critical included having individuals use the innovation as frequently as possible and as a regular agency practice rather than as a separate project. The new practice, moreover, had a better chance of surviving if it completely displaced the old procedure. In addition to constant use of the new practice, it must also continue to gain increased support from agency practitioners. Yin determined this was most likely to happen if the innovation operated effectively in the eyes of the practitioner. These benefits, the author notes, might well be different than those evaluated by external evaluation.

Along with practitioner support, successful innovations required the specific support of top agency administrators. Without their advocacy new practices seldom were routinized and continued to be viewed as special projects.

Using Intermediary Agencies

Intermediary agencies are defined as state, regional and local organizations which coordinate and administer federal programs. Issues involved in creating an effective federal-state partnership are complex and diverse. The role of the intermediary agency may include fiscal agent, program coordinator, funding sources for local projects, linking agent between federal requirements and local programs, program monitor and implementor of federal programs.

Key Points: There is a **strong rationale for collaborating with intermediaries** to promote educational renewal and change.

To maintain a distribution of power, **federal agencies have relied on state-based organizations** to implement federal regulations and address priorities of the states.

Intermediate agencies are logical groups to **bring about change** in local schools because they command a variety of resources and skills, can exercise planning leadership, can link resources within regions, fill a negotiating role between local districts and federal agencies and can provide technical assistance and support systems.

The role of many state agencies is **hampered by a lack of resources.**

The federal-state partnership must **balance power and priorities** in achieving educational change.

Important ingredients include:
- **Trust in the skill and expertise of professional staff**
- **Clarity of** program **objectives**
- **Adaptability** to meet local needs
- **General support and enthusiasm**

Damaging to change these efforts are:
- **Frequent change** of federal monitors
- Rapidly **changing** federal **priorities**
- Lack of **effective support and communications**

Local conditions have more of an effect on implementation than federal policies and procedures. Important are:
- Skillful **leadership**
- **Commitment** to the project
- Eliciting **broad based support**
- **Effective technical assistance** to local schools

Funded intermediaries have been found to:
- Rely on **ineffective planning approaches**
- **Ignore local problems**
- Fail to provide appropriate **intervention and leadership** to help teachers and administrators

Intermediate agencies may **operate primarily to meet their own agendas.**

Ineffectiveness may be **caused by** the **structure** of intermediary organizations which:

- **Limits staff development**
- causes **rigidity**
- **Limits efficiency**

Needed are:

- Development of **clear program objectives**
- **Increased local involvement** in determining program priorities
- **Improved skills** of federal monitors
- Specific **technical assistance**
- **Accountability**

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Critics claim that the major financial investment made in both categorical and general assistance grant-in-aid programs have had few positive outcomes. Extensive analysis of federally instigated educational reform programs has lead to conclusions that the massive distribution of funds to state and local educational agencies has resulted in little evidence of consistent or stable improvement in student outcomes. (Berman and McLaughlin, 1976)

In perhaps a more serious and pervasive criticism of the system, others have noted that agencies receiving federal monies have misused funds, failed to implement programs and disregarded the intent of grant-in-aid assistance. In a commentary about failures to implement Title I regulations one author notes:

> Clearly, violations of Title I regulations and criteria have continued since 1967 in at least 37 states and this situation cannot be explained away either in terms of the newness of the Title I program or the short time available to adapt management systems to its requirements. After six fiscal years of Title I funding, the program has not yet been implemented nationally as intended by Congress. (Wargo in Murphy, 1973)

Authors outside of education point to other dilemmas in the system. Bardach comments:

> The projects proposed by the Port of Oakland, which the EDA embraced quite warmly at first, were not chosen because they were "the best" nor even because they were particularly "good," but because they were the only ones "ready to go." (Bardach, 1977)

On one hand, federal agency staff are frustrated and often dismayed by evidence that funded intermediary agencies have done little to carry out specified program mandates and fallen far short of implementing

project objectives. On the other, funded regional, state and local agencies are highly critical of federal management and accountability efforts and denounce the infusion of complex and seemingly useless reports, forms, and required evaluations for federal programs.

The issues involved in creating an effective federal-state partnership and in determining useful monitoring methods are complex and diverse. As a result, this paper attempts to clarify only a limited number of the problems involved in federal-intermediary relationships. In doing so, a number of questions have guided our inquiry. These include:

- Can funding intermediaries facilitate program implementation?
- What issues interfere with effective relationships between federal and intermediary agencies?
- What options exist for increasing effective program compliance by funded agencies?

Publications assessing federal agencies' efforts to identify the obstacles in achieving program implementation through the use of funded intermediaries were critically reviewed, as were problems encountered by intermediaries in attempting to implement federally designed programs. From this, a number of areas of conflict became obvious. These will be delineated in following sections of the paper. In addition, some authors went beyond analysis of existing problems and proposed alternatives to the present system. These proposals are identified in the concluding section of the literature review.

Rationale for Funding Intermediary Organizations

In the context of this paper, intermediary agencies are state, regional and local organizations which coordinate and administer federal grant-in-aid programs. In the sphere of education, state education agencies, educational research and development laboratories and regional

and intermediate service districts may all fill the role of an intermediate agency. As such, they act as fiscal agent, program coordinator, funding source for local projects, linking agent between federal requirements and local programs, program monitor and, in some instances, direct implementor of federal programs to improve educational practice.

There is a strong rationale for collaborating with intermediaries to promote educational renewal and change. Philosophically, as former Commissioner of Education Keppel commented: "In a nation of 50 states with vast and independent enterprises for education, the federal government must participate--not toward domination, but as a partner in a vital enterprise." (Keppel in Murphy, 1973)

As federal participation in the educational effort has increased, creating a balance between federal and state initiatives has been an issue of considerable importance. To maintain a distribution of power, federal agencies have relied heavily on state-based organizations to implement--and to a certain degree adopt--federal regulations to address the priorities of the states.

In a pragmatic sense, moreover, intermediate agencies are logical groups to bring about change in local schools. They have, as one reviewer of the roles of educational service agencies illustrates, a variety of resources and skills at their command, including an areawide perspective of problems, an ability to exercise leadership in regional planning, a facility in linking resources within regions and staff to carry out programming and evaluation. (Allen, 1978) In addition, alliances with intermediaries offer federal agencies a viable alternative to the complexities of dealing directly with thousands of local educational

districts. As Herriott and Gross comment in a critique of the Experimental Schools Program, federal-local funding efforts are often fraught with exceedingly complex problems. For example, federal attempts to directly fund local school districts are often severely impeded by a general distrust among school officials of federal agencies, a fear of enforced federal control, a lack of specificity in federal requirements and vastly different perspectives on how to implement "comprehensive" educational change. (Herriott and Gross, 1979)

In the minds of many, then, intermediaries can offer services that federal agencies are hard pressed to replicate. Intermediaries can facilitate the federal-local partnership by filling a negotiating role between federal and local officials, by providing ready response to district concerns, by identifying needed technical assistance resources and by developing effective and useful support systems.

Although a persuasive case may be made for funding intermediate agencies to aid in implementing school improvement programs, the literature also clearly illustrates that intermediaries, including state education agencies, frequently impede rather than assist in attempts to administer federal initiatives. For example, in identifying problems encountered in the administration of Title V of the ESEA, Murphy specifies the organizational problems faced by many state agencies. He notes that, although some SEAs are well managed and amply staffed, many had reputations of weakness and conservatism. Moreover, most lack the resources even to provide adequate leadership, direction and service to existing state educational programs. (Murphy, 1973) Similarily, in a critique of Title I of the ESEA (funding to improve educational programs for low income children), Murphy concludes that state agencies were either powerless or ineffective in administering and

monitoring educational programs for low income children, and that local programs, in fact, were relatively free in establishing their own priorities for use of funds. In Massachusetts, for example, an analysis of problems encountered in the state agency in implementing Title V of the ESEA spotlighted issues such as program implementors not being reformers, inadequate staff to conduct monitoring, a disinclination to carry out evaluation activities, a law and tradition favoring local control and, finally, a federal system with such dispersion of power and control that it makes it nearly impossible to impose federal priorities. (Murphy, 1971)

In sum, involvement of state and regional organizations in developing, administering and evaluating federal educational legislation is a necessary and important ingredient in the federal-state partnership. Nonetheless, as appropriate and necessary as it may seem, the partnership is often an uneasy and, at times, ineffective truce involving a shifting and balancing of power and priorities that further compounds the difficulties inherent in achieving educational change.

Perspectives on the Problem

Shortcomings in the management of programs and questionable success in achieving positive and desired project outcomes raise a number of important questions. Exactly what kinds of federal intermediary problems are occurring? Are federal agencies primarily at fault? If so, how? Are funded intermediate agencies unable or unwilling to carry out federal directives? Are the methods used by federal agencies consistent with the strategies recognized by researchers as effective means of promoting change?

In answering these questions, it seems important to begin by summarizing researchers' conclusions about what programmatic and

organizational features promote the adoption of innovations. The Rand study on "Implementing and Sustaining Innovations" provides a particularly useful list of criteria. According to Berman and McLaughlin, characteristics in the local institutional setting, rather than program goals, have a primary influence on whether or not a program is implemented. This includes the attitudes, skills and leadership ability of individuals involved in the change effort. In addition, the authors identified these following factors as having significant bearing on whether or not funded programs are implemented:

- Programs that allow for mutual adoption and permit influencing program goals and objectives to meet local needs are more specifically more likely to be implemented.
- Projects undertaken for opportunistic reasons usually fail to create change because staff lack involvement and commitment to the project's purposes.
- Participation of teachers in all phases of program implementation and evaluation and active involvement of administration are essential features for mobilizing support of new programs.
- Programs that are challenging, demanding and offer opportunities to increase one's professional expertise were more likely to elicit staff commitment than those that were routine or limited in scope.
- Clarity of program objectives had a direct positive impact on program implementation.
- Effective leadership at the local school, district and project level is vital in order to achieve successful educational change.

Similarly, in a study conducted on the role of professional organizations in fostering new practices in city government, the author concludes that success in promoting change in city government was directly tied to the technical and professional skill of the staff advocating the innovation. Furthermore, effective use of frequent transfer techniques such as workshops, meetings and regular publications were among the most

useful means of communicating change techniques. The author also emphasized the importance of trust in professional association staff as an informal but necessary ingredient in promoting new technologies.

In sum, factors that contribute to adopting and using innovations in organizations are strongly tied to the technical expertise and professional skill of the program promoter, the clarity of program objectives, the degree that program implementors are able to adapt features to meet local needs, the general support and enthusiasm generated at all levels of staff and administration, and the extent that the innovation actually addresses a real local need.

The problems that intermediary agencies encounter in carrying out federally funded programs can be examined with these recommendations in mind.

The problems that plagued the Experimental Schools Program, a federal project to initiate comprehensive change in a range of urban and rural school districts, seem symptomatic of problems in federal funding to intermediary agencies. Kirst, in an article describing relationships supporting educational change, identifies the following as serious problems stemming from the federal level: (1) multiple, vague and often contradictory federal objectives, (2) inflexible implementation policies that relied heavily on paper compliance and (3) delays in federal response that frequently interfered with local planning and implementation. (Kirst in Herriott, 1979)

Bailey and Mosher in a critique of the Office of Education's administration of the ESEA point to the preceding as well as to additional problems that complicate attempts to carry out federal program directives.

Those identified included:

- Poorly timed funding requiring programs to be launched midyear
- Paper work, red tape and federal control which included complex applications, duplicate information requirements and extensive reporting
- Difficulties in finding qualified staff to launch newly funded programs
- Problems in identifying effective evaluation efforts

The specific frustrations among state agencies over federal reporting requirements are even more clearly illustrated in a recent paper by Donovan and Rumbaugh. In their critique of the role of federal evaluation requirements, the authors state that federal requirements usually focus on final reporting and "are neither of use in state or local programs nor instructional decision making." In respect to Title I evaluation, Donovan and Rumbaugh assert that federal programs are becoming more and more prescriptive and that procedures are frequently insensitive to state and local policy and program needs. (Donovan and Rumbaugh, 1979) Furthermore, they note that the mandatory implementation of evaluation models has resulted in the diversion of resources primarily to fulfill federal requirements.

Finally, Herriott and Gross, in an analysis of federal-local funding difficulties, point out that the frequent change of federal monitors, rapidly changing Washington political priorities and the general lack of effective support and adequate communications between Washington programs and local school districts do much to damage change efforts. Although the authors also note that local districts often lack the ability to develop specific and pragmatic plans to implement federal programs, they further assert that federal officials were seldom aware

of problems in program implementation and were not willing to scale down unrealistic goals when serious problems arose. (Herriott and Gross, 1979)

From the perspective of these authors, then, federal agencies are creating part of the problem, and their methods of conducting working relationships with intermediaries could be improved on a number of fronts. However, the problem is complex, and we would be remiss to ignore the role that intermediaries themselves play in directly or indirectly blocking federal efforts to improve practice. Instead, as the literature review illustrates, funded intermediate agencies often do as much to muddy the waters and inhibit federal efforts as the federal agencies themselves.

For example, the Rand study clearly points out that conditions in the local institutional setting have far more influence on actual program implementation than differing federal policies and procedures. Although these authors acknowledge that federal seed money may be essential for generating interest in new programs, they further conclude that local efforts make the difference between successful and unsuccessful implementation. Critical local characteristics identified in this report include availability of skillful leadership, commitment to the project, ability of program directors to elicit broad-based support and involvement in project goals, and skill in providing effective technical assistance to local schools. In the programs analyzed however, funded intermediaries, more often than not, failed to provide leadership or assistance critical for the implementation of successful programs. More specifically, intermediaries that are funded to implement local educational programs often relied on ineffective ad hoc planning approaches, ignored local problems that impeded program implementation, and failed to provide

appropriate intervention and leadership to help teachers and administrators put programs to work. (Berman and McLaughlin, 1976)

In The Implementation Game: What Happens After a Bill Becomes a Law, Eugene Bardach critically examines barriers in implementing innovative programs in a variety of government and social service agencies. In his commentary he notes that opportunism and the desire for easy money is often a strong motivator for agency involvement in federal programs. The money is viewed as a general resource to first meet goals of the agency rather than federal program objectives. Bardach also stresses the real difficulties encountered in successfully evaluating a program's accomplishments and achievement of objectives. He notes:

> It can confidently be asserted that all performance measurement procedures are imperfect and a good many are vulnerable to deliberate abuse, and that therefore the controlling agent must invest resources in monitoring the quality of its reports.

For Bardach, then, the intermediate agency operates primarily to meet its own agenda, which may be substantially different than that of the funding agency, and that agencies consistently work to reduce requirements for accountability.

Finally, Jerome Murphy, in an extensive analysis of Title V of the ESEA on state education agencies, attributes the program's ineffectiveness to the structure of organizations themselves, rather than to specific conditions such as inadequate leadership. He states that the failure of state agencies to carry out real internal staff and program upgrading is due to organizational rigidity. According to Murphy's perspective, organizations do not move flexibly to maximize efficiency, but change slowly to minimize uncertainty. Moreover, organizations receiving general rather than categorical assistance usually concentrate energy

on short-term needs and pressing problems, rather than grappling with the appropriateness of current programming activities. Title V programs illustrated that federal money is not used primarily to change, but rather to extend, current modes of operating and that federal priorities are ignored if they interfere with existing SEA procedures and priorities.

In summary, intermediary agencies responsible for carrying out federal education programs often compound and complicate the problems faced by federal agencies. They do so by viewing federal money as a necessary means of supporting current agency agendas, and by resisting federal attempts to initiate or direct changes in the agencies' current priorities. In other words, many regional, state and local agencies acting as funded intermediaries are not organizationally amenable to federal program objectives. They strongly resist top-down change efforts. Additionally, these agencies are often organizationally unprepared for managing and evaluating federal programs. Staff and resources are too limited to carry out the tasks necessary for supporting real change in local schools. The agencies fall seriously short in anticipating barriers to implementation, in monitoring program successes, and in providing appropriate and consistent technical assistance to local staff and administrators. Intermediaries and federal agencies, then, both operate in ways that impede the attainment of program objectives.

Improving Federal-Intermediary Relationships

Federal agencies, including the Regional Program, are concerned with promoting programs that impact positively on educational practice. To do so, at least two issues (and possibly many more not discussed in this paper) call for consideration. First, how can federal agencies establish

more effective and productive relationships with regional and state agencies which have major responsibility for providing programs to local educators? Second, what methods can be used by government agencies to determine the effectiveness of intermediary agencies in carrying out federal programs and in accomplishing project objectives?

The literature review illustrates that a good many current authors place the blame for troublesome federal-local relationships squarely on the shoulders of federal officials. As Gross and Herriott state in their analysis of the Experimental Schools Program, "interactions between the 'feds' and 'locals' were characterized by misunderstandings, misperceptions, distrust and lack of confidence. At times they appeared to be adversaries, rather than collaborators, in an important educational enterprise." (Herriott and Gross, 1979)

Authors who have analyzed federal efforts to promote educational change urge reconsideration of federal agency policies and procedures and place considerable emphasis on creating more effective working relationships between agencies. This includes, in part, developing clear program objectives, increasing local agencies' involvement in determining program priorities and improving the skill of federal monitors in assisting intermediaries to implement federal programs.

The recommendations of Michael Kirst and Neil Gross, in their critique of federal attempts to implement "comprehensive change" in educational districts, further illustrate some of the communication strategies that might facilitate needed collaboration. Kirst notes, in his assessment of federal-local relationships, that vague, overly ambitious and unrealistic program objectives contributed considerably to agency misunderstandings and eventual distrust. Local districts either needed

effective consultants to act in an intermediary role or more direct access to responsive federal officials who could provide ready answers to critical questions. In addition to unclear program goals, federal program priorities were "not congruent with many localities' views of their own needs." Mutual adoption, strongly recommended for successful implementation, was seldom considered in these federal efforts. Vital mid-course adaptations that would allow redefining priorities in line with evolving teacher and student needs were not permitted. Kirst further notes that rigid federal adherence to specific federal requirements impeded program implementation and that "planning and implementing changes will never be successful unless teachers and principals are involved all the way." (Kirst, 1979)

Robert Herriott, in commenting on federal-local problems in program implementation, stresses the need for skilled federal officials who are able to establish "effective, efficient and flexible arrangements and procedures designed to offer maximum service to the field." Since many of the local administrators involved in federal programs lacked planning, implementation and leadership skills, federal project monitors must be particularly astute in diagnosing local problems and aiding in promoting solutions.

Finally, Richard Bingham points out that institutional change is a political problem rather than an administrative or managerial one. In order to manage complex political issues, agencies and administrators should be provided with specific technical assistance in dealing with the political realities of their institution. (Bingham, 1978)

Federal agencies can, then, improve federal-local relationships by clarifying project objectives, becoming more responsive and accessible

to local and government officials, providing opportunities for local agencies to adapt Washington priorities to local needs, and improving the planning, technical assistance and political skills of project monitors. Accomplishing these objectives will, current authors argue, promote more productive and collaborative arrangements with agencies and facilitate a coordinated effort toward solving major educational problems.

Although federal agencies can, in many instances, work toward constructing more positive working relationships with intermediaries, this does not directly address ways to improve the effectiveness of agencies in accomplishing federal project objectives. The second question to be considered, then, is what methods can federal agencies use, first to improve, and second to ascertain, the effectiveness of intermediaries in managing federal programs and delivering services?

One author concludes that government agencies must design individual strategies to assist intermediate agencies in carrying out program objectives. Herriott notes that agencies differ considerably in their ability to manage the implementation of federal grants. Consequently, officials need to anticipate the program planning and training assistance needed by agencies to carry through on program priorities. (Herriott, 1979) One way to address this problem, according to a second author, is to require grant applicants to spell out potential implementation problems and identify anticipated ways of overcoming these. This would, at the very least, give program reviewers an opportunity to assess the planning perspective of intermediate agencies and identify potential needed areas of technical assistance. (Kent, 1979) In a similar recommendation, Herriott notes that federal project officers need to be apprised of potential obstacles that may occur at each level of the planning and

implementation cycle and be able to suggest strategies for overcoming these problems as they begin to interfere with delivering programs.

Michael Kirst, moreover, recommends that federal programs actively involve federal grant recipients in determining a good deal of the accountability criteria themselves. Program recipient involvement in identifying accountability methods and consistent use of onsite review teams to evaluate local program quality provide more potential for effective monitoring than paper compliance to federal efforts. This author further argues that program expansion at the district or state level should be conditional and tied to the effectiveness of current local programs. He states:

> In short, making the program expansion within a school district contingent on performance of participating schools may cause districts both to exert pressure on schools to implement their own plans and encourage central district offices to provide the kind of support the school sites need. (Kirst, 1979)

Jerome Murphy, in a critique of Title V of the ESEA, urges that federal agencies employ three alternative methods of improving intermediary agency accountability. All three involve establishing independent evaluation units. They include assigning monitoring tasks to another intergovernmental agency, to a publicly supported agency, or to a quasi-independent agency. He urges involvement of a third part as a "watchdog" of funded agencies and views this strategy as more realiable than dependency on agency reports which "tend to exaggerate the favorable and minimize the shortcomings." Murphy further suggests that federal agencies actually explore various approaches to monitoring and see what works and under what conditions. (Murphy, 1973)

Finally, Bingham, Murphy and others point to the pressing need for providing effective technical assistance to aid project directors in

dealing with political realities. They suggest developing teams of experts who have direct implementation experience and are particularly skilled in coping with political considerations. (Bingham, 1978; Murphy, 1979)

Achieving increased project effectiveness and monitoring agency followthrough is a complex issue, and the multiple dimensions of it have not been explored in sufficient detail. Instead, a variety of suggestions that authors offer as viable alternatives to current monitoring practices have been presented. These include involving agencies receiving grants in determining accountability measures, making increases in funding dependent upon current local program successes, providing for nonagency related monitoring including onsite visitations, and developing technical assistance teams to help project directors address the political aspects of implementing new programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Jack, et al. A Study of Educational Service Districts in Oregon. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, July, 1978.

Bailey, Stephen and Edith K. Mosher. ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law. Syracuse University Press, 1968.

Bardach, Eugene. The Implementation Game: What Happens After a Bill Becomes a Law. MIT Press, 1977.

Berke, Joel S., et al. Federal Aid to Public Education: Who Benefits? Policy Institute of the Syracuse University Research Corporation (Ford Foundation Grant), January, 1971 (ED051 441).

Berman, Paul, William McLaughin and Milbrey Wallin. "Implementation of Educational Innovation." Educational Forum, V. 40, No. 3, March, 1976.

Bingham, Richard, et al. Professional Associations as Intermediaries in Transferring Technology to City Governments, (Executive Summary). National Science Foundation, August, 1978.

Brickell, Henry M. "The Influence of External Political Factors on the Role and Methodology of Evaluation." AERA Paper, 1974.

Caulley, Darrell N. and Arden D. Grotelueschen. "The Illusionment of Learner Accomplishment." Educational Leadership, January, 1978.

Coulson, John M. "Theoretical Antecedents of the Knowledge Dissemination and Utilization Tradition." Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning, V. 54, No. 2, April, 1978.

Derthick, Martha. The Influence of Federal Grants: Public Assistance in Massachusetts. Harvard University Press, Cambridge Massachusetts, 1970.

Donovan, David L. and Stanley A. Rumbaugh. The Intervention Between Policy and Evolution Within the Michigan Department of Education. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory Paper (in process).

Emrick, John and Susan Peterson. A Synthesis of Findings Across Five Recent Studies in Educational Dissemination and Change, (Revised). Far West Laboratory, June, 1978.

Goodlad, John I. "Educational Leadership: Toward the Third Era." Educational Leadership, January, 1978.

Halprin, Samuel. "The Way I See It: We Can't Get There From Here." Educational Leadership, October, 1979.

Herriott, Robert E. and Neal Gross. The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change. McCutchan Publishing Corporation, Berkeley, California, 1979.

Murphy, Jerome T. Grease the Squeaky Wheel: A Report on the Implementation of Title V of the ESEA. Center for Educational Policy Research, Harvard Graduate School of Education, February, 1973.

_____ "Title I of ESEA: The Politics of Implementing Federal Educational Reform" Harvard Educational Review, V. 41, 1971.

Radnor, Michael, et al. Information Dissemination and Exchange for Educational Innovations: Conceptual and Implementation Issues of a Regionally-Based Nationwide System, (Executive Summary), December, 1977.

Stout, Jerry B. "The Intermediate Unit as a Change Agent." Presentation at American Association of School Administrators, 1973 (ED 078 498).

Stufflebeam, Daniel L., et al. Design for Evaluating R&D Institutions and Programs. Ohio State University, August, 1971 (ED 061 298).

Unruh, Glenys G. "New Essentials in Curriculum Development." Educational Leadership, May, 1976.

Yin, Robert K. Changing Urban Bureaucracies: How New Practices Become Routinized, (Executive Summary). Rand Corporation, Washington, D. C., March, 1978.

Bingham, Richard, et al. Professional Associations as Intermediaries in Transferring Technology to City Governments, (Executive Summary). National Science Foundation, August, 1978.

Professional associations can be effective intermediaries in communicating information on innovations to their members. This study reviews the role that professional associations actually play in transferring innovations to city government officials. It also summarizes the factors that contribute to organizations being effective information disseminators.

The study notes that professional organizations surveyed for this report succeeded in getting information out to appropriate individuals, but did little to aid in creating a climate for the acceptance of the innovation. The authors claim this is a definite shortcoming of current organizations because transferring information successfully may well be meaningless if local acceptance for the innovation cannot also be accomplished.

Professional organizations, reviewed for this study, also differed in the way members perceived their effectiveness in transferring information on new technology. Factors identified as critical for effective dissemination of information included employing highly qualified staff, producing a number of regular quality publications, and using a variety of dissemination techniques, i.e., seminars, conferences and workshops, to transfer information.

Since associations have been relatively effective in getting out information, but ineffective in helping with critical implementation problems, the authors urge organizations to augment current approaches with technical assistance teams. These teams would respond to specific agency requests and provide skilled assistance with the political considerations involved in using new technology.

Herriott, Robert E. and Neal Gross. The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change. McCutchan Publishing Corporation, Berkeley, California, 1979.

The Experimental Schools Program was an effort to develop comprehensive rather than piecemeal change in rural and urban school districts. Herriott and Gross' book is a compilation of articles that provide a thoughtful analysis of how and why this program of planned change failed to accomplish its goals. The authors address the specific issues and shortcomings in the federal change effort and also assess broader conceptual issues in effecting the management of change. Both perspectives, i.e., the federal and the local, are examined in determining how these programs fell short of accomplishing major goals.

Serious problems stemming from the federal level are identified. These include: (1) multiple, vague and often contradictory federal objectives, (2) inflexible implementation policies that relied heavily on paper compliance and (3) delays in federal response that frequently interferred with local planning and implementation. Local districts similarly contributed to muddying the waters. They were, according to Herriott and Gross, seldom able to develop specific and pragmatic plans to implement change programs and lacked the leadership skills to know how to carry through on major efforts.

The book concludes with a chapter on theoretical and practical implications and recommendations for dealing with future change efforts. These include a call for developing individually designed strategies to assist districts with implementation and to improve leadership skills at both local and federal levels.

Murphy, Jerome. Grease the Squeaky Wheel: A Report on the Implementation of Title V of the ESEA. Center for Educational Policy Research, Harvard Graduate School of Education, February, 1973.

Does providing general financial assistance to institutions result in institutional reforms? Are obstacles to more effective institutions really the absence of discretionary resources or the overabundance of federal red tape? Murphy poses these questions at the onset of his analysis of Title V funds, a federal education program directed at funding SEAs to strengthen their leadership and programming capabilities. Provided with grants having minimal restrictions, state agencies were urged to develop plans to strengthen their role as educational leaders. But according to the author, few state agencies used Title V funds to effectively strengthen their programming or improve staff capabilities. The reason for this, argues Murphy, is that "organizations do not move flexibly to maximize efficiency, but change slowly to minimize uncertainty." Thus, rather than using a rational decision making process of assessing needs, defining objectives and exploring alternatives, state agencies concentrated more often than not in doing more of the same. Money was used to extend current modes of operation rather than to initiate changes or improvements.

In light of Title V's failure to foster change in state agencies, Murphy assesses the alternatives available to promoting change in institutions. He argues persuasively that general assistance grants will do little to help institutions identify more effective programs of action or improve management capabilities.

According to the author, the most feasible solution to the problems identified is to use outside organizations to pressure for and assess the results of efforts to promote change. Murphy's analysis points out that

most institutions have far greater forces pushing to maintain the status quo than those working towards determining rational approaches to improve agency functioning. In his estimate only heavy pressure from outside agencies will promote more accountability among funded intermediaries.

Improving Educational Practice

It is commonly assumed that the vitality of a particular field or organization depends greatly upon its ability to adopt new innovations and to change constructively to meet internal needs and external demands. A variety of methods for achieving needed changes in the educational system have been proposed.

Key Points: **Methods of achieving improvement** include:

- Changes in teaching and learning with emphasis on **revising curriculum**
- **Systemwide self-renewal**
- **Dissemination of research and development results**

The **perspective** of how one could successfully improve educational practice was **continually re-evaluated** during the 60s and 70s. It began with emphasis on curriculum, organization and instructional change and ended with attention to human rights, equity and socioeconomic reforms.

The **sucess of divergent attempts** to improve practice has been **viewed differently** by various authors.

Most authors feel **attempts to bring about substantive changes** in education are **still having too little impact.**

The **few attempts to define change** include:

- Any **alteration of the status quo**
- Introduction of **new patterns of action, belief and attitudes**
- **Modification of the structure and process** of the social system

Innovations may be viewed as the **missing elements** that will bring a system nearer to completion or a satisfactory equilibrium. Characteristics of an optional system include:

- **Open flow of resources**
- Sharing of **common purpose**
- **Attentiveness to needs** of members
- **Use of external inputs**
- **Effective problem solving**
- **Skill in monitoring outputs and redirecting goals**

Improved practice may occur **when all actors maximize their ability to** recognize problems and find effective solutions.

Three **basic strategies for affective change** are:

- Empirical/Rational approach based on reason and information
- Normative/Re-Educative approaches emphasizes problem solving
- Poser/Coercive approach involves direct influencing and controlling of actions

Categorization can be based on **different interventions appropriate to resolve problems** such as:

- Practitioners lack knowledge
- There is a lack of equity in distribution of resources, instruction, materials and training
- Staff is stagnating
- Participants are isolated
- Inadequate sharing of skills

Potential blocks to change efforts include:

- Conditions in the local environment
- Failure to diagnose or anticipate problems
- Complexity in changing behavior
- Lack of rewards

While **adapting our innovation to local conditions** often is necessary for acquiring ownership, local adaptation may be **based on political expediency and substantially reduce effectiveness of an innovation.**

The **link between research and practice must be direct.**

Information alone does not bring about long-term change.

Competent technical assistance may be the critical ingredient in implementing innovations.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

All areas of endeavor are sensitive to the issues of self-renewal, improvement and change. In fact, it is commonly assumed that the vitality of a particular field or organization depends greatly upon its ability to adopt new innovations and to change constructively to meet internal needs and external demands. As a consequence, researchers and practitioners are constantly engaged in finding ways that systems or parts of systems can improve. In medicine, for example, this may involve discovery and use of a new drug or diagnostic procedure; in agriculture, the advent of a highly efficient fertilizer; in mental health, the adoption of community health centers; and in education, the development of community learning experiences.

It is clear from the literature that the concern with improvement of practice in all of these areas is a frequent theme. It is also evident that the achievement of improved practice is integrally related to the adoption of innovations and the dynamics of planned change. For many authors, improved practice often appears to be viewed as the outcome of adopting innovations or undertaking changes in existing procedures, practices or organizational structure.

Although improving practice is referred to frequently, and is the obvious goal for all attempts to change and adopt new practices, it is seldom defined. Instead authors focus their attention on the activities that are considered necessary to achieve improved practice. These have involved a variety of educational reform and improvement efforts, as Gross and Herriott illustrate.

> Change efforts were most frequently directed at the following kinds of problems: the low reading test scores of large numbers of elementary school pupils; the functional illiteracy exhibited by many high school graduates; high rates of student dropout, truancy, and other forms of deviant behavior; outmoded curriculum and dysfunctional teaching methods; and the hostile feelings about school experiences on the part of an increasing proportion of adolescents who perceive school as meaningless or irrelevant to their immediate needs and long-range interests. (Herriott and Gross, 1979)

In other words, as Matthew Miles points out, the "language of educational reform in America has developed and shifted almost mercurially in the last twenty years." (Miles, 1978) A variety of methods for achieving needed changes in the educational system have been proposed. Some involved changes in teaching and learning with emphasis on revising curriculum approaches. Others required implementing a process for systemwide self-renewal. Still others called for successfully disseminating the results of educational research and development to the educational community. Regardless of the approach advocated, however, each was seen as "the missing elements which will supposedly bring the system nearer to completion or to a more satisfactory equilibrium." (Havelock and Huberman, 1978)

The literature illustrates that the perspective of how one could best achieve quality education and successfully improve educational practice was continual re-evaluation during the 60s and 70s. It began with emphasis on change in curriculum, organization and instruction and ended with attention to human rights, equity and socioeconomic reform. (Goodlad, 1979)

The success of these divergent attempts to improve practice has been viewed differently by various authors. For example, in one study, conducted in the early 70s on the nature and frequency of innovation occurring in schools, the authors found that change and innovation was prevalent in almost all districts surveyed. The results led the study's authors to

conclude that the "findings suggest a continuous ferment of change in almost all U. S. school districts. On the face of it, many of these changes are profound, not trivial." (Havelock and Havelock, 1973) Other educational researchers were far less optimistic in their findings. In another major study, which involved observing specific educational programs, the authors noted not an abundance of change, but a significant "gap between the rhetoric of reform in American schooling and reality as we perceived it." The authors of this critique of efforts to improve education went on to comment: "What bothered us most was the apparent absence of processes by means of which the schools and the people in them might have some reasonable prospect for self-renewal." (Goodlad, 1979)

These two commentaries highlight the differing perspectives on the degree and significance of the change occurring in the educational system. For most current authors, however, the attempts to bring about substantive changes in education are still having too little impact. Summarizing this concern, Lipham argues in a recent paper:

> Many major and minor educational change programs have been conceived, researched. . . yet we find that they have little or no impact on improved practices in local schools. (Lipham, 1979)

In other words, past approaches to improve practice have not been enough. Education continues to be faced with the need to perform better, to devise new methods that will more effectively teach the fundamentals of reading, writing and computation and to prepare students for complex new social roles. Given this situation, this literature review sets out to gain additional perspective on the problem of improving practice by:

1. Identifying some of the conceptual issues involved in the study of innovations and planned change that offer insight on the issue of improving practice
2. Reviewing the major approaches to improving practice

3. Looking at how improving practice in social science differs from that in the sciences

4. Summarizing what has been learned from the past efforts to improve practice

Defining and Describing

Although the terms "improving practice" and "educational improvement" appear frequently in educational literature, there are almost no attempts to define them. Fortunately the literature on planned change is somewhat richer in definitions and a number of these efforts contribute to a clearer understanding of improving practice.

Zaltmann and Duncan, in their book Strategies for Planned Change, note that change is not a unique phenomena, that almost everything is in a fairly constant state of fluctuation. Since this is so, they ask what constitutes a significant modification or alteration in behavior that can be called change. The authors summarize a number of researchers' definitions of change. They note that Lippitt views organizational change as "any planned or unplanned alteration of the status quo which effects the structure, technology, and human resources of the total agency." On the other hand, Schoen defines change as the introduction of new patterns of action, belief and attitudes among substantial segments of the population. Zaltmann further notes that change takes different forms. It may be radical or routine, it may be an idea or concept, a practice, a physical product or a service. But in any event it modifies "the structure and process of the social system such that it requires members of that system to relearn how they perform their roles." (Zaltmann and Duncan, 1979)

Moreover, the authors argue that all innovations imply change. But not all change involves innovation. (Zaltmann and Duncan, 1979) Change, then, modifies the current structure or functions of an organization or

modifies the patterns of belief, action and relationship of the people in the organization. It may occur through the infusion of new ideas, new practices, new products or services. Planned change, moreover, "is a deliberate effort with a stated goal on the part of the change agent to create modification in the structure and process of the social system." (Zaltmann and Duncan, 1979)

In a recent publication on educational innovations in developing countries, Havelock and Huberman add an additional perspective to the understanding of innovation and improving practice. The authors contend that innovations are viewed as the missing elements that will supposedly bring the system nearer to completion or to a more satisfactory equilibrium. Characteristics of this optional system include: an open flow of resources among parts of the system; personal cohesiveness and the sharing of a common purpose; attentiveness to the ongoing needs of its members; ability to maximize use of external inputs; facility to carry out effective problem solving; and skill in monitoring its own outputs and selectively redirecting goals and functions when necessary and appropriate.

These characteristics describe a system that is capable of appropriate change and skillful adoption of new innovations. It is also one in which practice can exist at an optimal level.

Miles and Goodlad, in their respective publications, view change principally in light of an organization's ability to be self-renewing. Miles defines self-renewal as the increase in "motivation and ability to do more systematic problem solving and deepen members' motivation for change." (Miles, 1979) For both authors, improved educational practice will occur when all actors in the drama maximize their ability to recognize significant problems and find effective solutions. For Miles and Goodlad, improved

practice relates directly to how creatively and productively the organization functions and to the "quality of life sustained" in the schools. Innovativeness and change are, one assumes, natural byproducts of the self-renewal process.

In sum, improved practice is intimately linked with the process of planned change. The term, "improvement" conveys the necessity to modify or adopt new practices, methods, behaviors or organizational structures to achieve a desired goal. In many instances, improved practice calls for incorporating innovations into the existing system. In other cases, it calls for the system itself to be energized. The purpose behind this is to arrive at a way of doing things that is more advantageous, more efficient and more effective than those previously employed and one that successfully promotes learner outcomes.

Models for Improving Practice

Despite the diversity in attempts to bring about constructive educational change, there have been a number of dominant themes that have guided efforts to improve practice.

Robert Chin notes that three basic strategies for effecting change have evolved: the empirical/rational, the normative/re-educative and the power/coercive. In the empirical/rational approach the process is based on reason and information. The essential tactic in this reason-based approach is to make new knowledge readily available. It is assumed that effective strategies adequately disseminated will be readily adopted by recipients.

The normative/re-educative process places primary emphasis on changing attitudes. It de-emphasizes the infusion of technical knowledge and focuses instead on the attitude, values, skills and relationships of the people

in the system that facilitate or resist change. Problem solving approaches are of paramount importance in this category.

Power approaches to effecting change are the third category. They involve the limiting of alternatives of individuals, the shaping of consequences, or the direct influencing and controlling of actions. "Major changes in the schools," concludes the author, "always involve some power operations."

Matthew Miles also provides a useful classification for understanding the varying approaches to educational improvement. Each category assumes that a different kind of appropriate intervention should be used to resolve the problems at hand.

The categories include the following:

1. The practitioners lack sufficient knowledge; they are backward and out of date. New technology and information is their critical need.

2. There is a lack of equity in the distribution of resources, good teachers, materials, training. To improve the situation, fairer distribution of the goods must be achieved.

3. The staff is stagnating! Will and energy is lacking. The action needed is a method of re-energizing participants.

4. Participants are experiencing a sense of isolation. They lack the resources to cope effectively.

5. There are inadequate means of deepening and sharing the skills that educational practitioners already possess. (Miles, 1978)

Goodlad offers an additional perspective on change efforts. He contends that the major theme in current efforts to improve practice has employed the research, development, dissemination model. In this system, researchers assess current problems, develop and test alternative solutions, devise appropriate products and then disseminate the results to schools. This strategy of providing innovative solutions to a

presumably receptive audience has, argues the author, been less than effective in bringing about the sought after educational improvements. Goodlad comments, "Practitioners perceived their problems differently and, frequently, did not see their answers, however elegantly packaged, as relevant." As an alternative model, the author advocates a change system in which "those within a given institution become responsive to what is required to assure institutional renewal and to outside resources most likely to expedite that renewal." (Goodlad, 1979)

In sum, researchers appear to have identified four major approaches to improving educational practice. The first relies heavily on external sources of knowledge, information and technology. It presumes that much of what is wrong with current schooling can be improved by infusing new knowledge, new approaches and new materials developed outside of the existing system. From this perspective the source of improvement lies primarily in updating educators; to increase efforts to acquaint them more directly with current research, and to help them adopt the programs that address their current needs.

The second approach presumes that the fundamental need is in improving the skills and abilities of individuals within the system. This approach is primarily process oriented and focuses on problem solving skills, conflict resolution, and promoting self-renewal. It relies on outside expertise not to bring in new products or materials, but to help individuals maximize their potential abilities.

The third calls for the use of power, incentives and direct or indirect coercion to bring about change. The coercive powers may operate from within or without the system. It may be district recommendations for change, community demands for improvement or government

mandates for compliance and it is usually less concerned with attitudes than with action.

The fourth approach, and that which appears to be currently in the forefront, calls for a meshing of the information providing, problem solving and self-renewal. It presumes that research must be directly linked to the needs of the client and that schools need new knowledge as well as improved skill in using the new information. It also recognizes that schools must be adept at recognizing useful approaches and incorporating new practices, but that innovations unrelated to local needs will create little positive change.

Improving Practice - Barriers to Change

Educators have used a variety of strategies to improve educational practice. But for many, change in education has still seemed to occur at an excruciatingly slow pace. For the critic of educational institutions, a frequent conclusion is that education is less amenable to change than science, business and medicine. In these areas technological proficiency seems to be on the increase, while in education many contend that current and past efforts seem to have resulted in little improvement.

Many perspectives on the barriers that interfere with educational improvement efforts exist. Berman and McLaughlin conclude that adoption of innovation and positive outcomes are strongly affected by the nature of implementation. Moreover, implementation depends almost exclusively on conditions in the local environment: on leadership, appropriate staff training and in the relation of innovation to current problems. The absence of any of these factors can be viewed as a real impediment to improved practice. (Berman and McLaughlin, 1976)

Herriott and Gross illustrate that other factors can block change efforts: failure to diagnose problems properly; inability to anticipate implementation problems; absence of effective monitoring and feedback; and minimal teacher participation. (Herriott and Gross, 1979)

But while innovations are often blocked in education, a closer examination of other fields, scientific as well as nonscientific, illustrates that change may not be as rapid as it is conceived to be. Rogers notes that in all fields there is considerable time lag before an innovation reaches wide acceptance. For example, it took over 14 years for hybrid seed corn to reach adoption in Iowa. (Rogers, 1962) Calsyn, in writing on a well disseminated and documented innovation in mental health, found that 44 per cent of the surveyed adopters were no longer using the innovation. (Calsyn, et al., 1977) Black, in commenting on needed changes in family planning techniques, argued that the existing community family planning system was outmoded and ineffective and came no where near meeting the need for effective solutions. (Black, no date)

Although there is evidence that some fields appear to be more responsive to change than in fact they may be, it is also conceivable, as Ronald Lippitt contends, that it is more difficult to use research in the areas of education and social practice than in the science. He argues the following:

1. Most significant adoptions of new education or social practice require significant changes in values and beliefs and require more personal involvement than new practices in business or medicine.

2. Most changes in social welfare and education call for a new pattern of behavior and a careful adaptation of the original innovation. The creative adaptation calls for more orientation than that called for in use of a new drug or new seed.

3. Practitioners in social practice and education receive little feedback about the effectiveness of the innovation. There

is seldom a visual sign of success and as a result there is less sense of reward for the effort and little data for quality control.

4. Education and social welfare are organized in a manner that provides little incentive for risk taking or using new resources. Both the competitive challenge and the quality communication channel are absent from these fields.

5. The social welfare and education fields have not developed the networks and linkages necessary to effectively relate research and operating practice to one another and they lack a means of providing quality inservice to upgrade the professions as new technology develops. (Lippitt, 1969)

In other words, the problems of improving practice in the social science fields are compounded by the need to change behavior patterns, values and attitudes; by the lack of rewards for innovativeness and by the difficulty to determine the effect of given inputs or replicate their outcomes. This perspective points out that while researchers may well need more effective access to practitioners and vice versa, more attention may also need to be paid to the internal nature of the system and the reason it provides so little reward for change and innovativeness.

Alternatives for Improving Practice

What, then, have two decades of attempts to improve practice taught educators and researchers? Information acquired from reform attempts includes the following:

1. Promoting the adoption of innovation is not enough. Successful implementation is the critical factor in determining whether the innovation will contribute to improved practice.

2. Emphasizing acquisition of information and knowledge by the schools does not necessarily bring about change within the system.

3. Schools do not normally subscribe to a research and development model--they are not actively looking for new ideas and ways to try them out.

4. Innovations must relate directly to the problems perceived by the individuals adopting the reform effort. If they do not provide a solution to a recognized need, innovation will experience a short institutional life.

The specific studies reviewed for this paper provided additional advice on efforts to improve practice. Robert Yin, in studying the change process in urban bureaucracies, concludes that a number of elements are vital for successful incorporation of new approaches. He notes there must be an internal advocate of the innovation who actively supports the idea and aids in the establishment of appropriate skills. The innovation also needs to be viewed as a regular practice and not as a special project. The more the change is incorporated into daily practice, the more likely it is to be routinized. The new practice, in addition, must be seen by the practitioner as having concrete benefits. These benefits may be considerably different than those that might be perceived as beneficial by external evaluators.

Berman and McLaughlin, in their well known work on the "Implementation of Educational Innovation" arrive at a number of additional conclusions. They assert change strategies must relate to the perceived needs of the school system. If they do not, the chance that the innovation will be maintained past the funding period is minimal. Moreover, innovations that permitted local adoption were far more likely to be retained than those that allowed for no local ownership to develop. Adapting the innovation to local conditions was often a necessary step for acquiring ownership. In addition, successful implementation in a district was closely tied to thorough staff training, frequent and regular staff meetings, the development of local materials, skillful administrative leadership and strong and broadbased commitment to the project.

Calsyn, et al., in a study of adoption of innovation in the mental health field, take issue with Berman's conclusion on the advisability of mutual adaptation. These authors caution proponents of adaptation and contend that many local adaptations are made on the basis of political expediency and may substantially reduce the effectiveness of the innovation. The authors also argue that in adopting fairly complex innovations, the use of printed materials and workshops is not enough. What is needed instead is action oriented technical assistance and the development of internal advocacy for the innovation.

In summarizing the role professional organizations play in supporting change in city government, Bingham concludes that professional associations were succeeding at getting information on innovation to groups, but that they had little or no impact on the creation of a climate for the acceptance of the innovation. The author notes that "success in the first two phases of the innovation transfer processes is meaningless if local officials are not able to accomplish the third, gaining local acceptance of the innovation." (Bingham, 1978)

Goodlad and Lipham, in their respective publications, concur that to direct most innovations specifically at changing teacher behavior may be an inappropriate model for change. Goodlad further contends that powerful internal forces set restrictions on teacher behavior and limit potential innovativeness. Lipham, on the other hand, notes that the principal plays possibly a more critical role than the teacher in effecting educational change. Both authors illustrate that the model for school change needs to include more than the participation of individual teachers working on special projects. Goodlad calls for involving the entire social system of the school in creating a problem solving and self-renewing

capacity and a momentum for change. In doing so the institution is able to focus on requirements for its own renewal and at the same time be receptive to resources outside the system that will expedite that process.

The review of the literature on educational change and adoption of innovations illustrates the complexity of the improving practice issue. In part the problems are due to difficulty in defining the priority goals of the schools. Are schools to emphasize conventional learning or are they to "become an active force in remedying social ills?" (Goodlad, 1979) Do we expect them to do both and if so, how? In part, as Lippitt contends, the difficulty in creating change relates to the way education and social practice are organized; the lack of incentive available to encourage innovation; the absence of effective resource networks; and the difficulty in determining the causal realtionship between input and output. But despite the inherent complexities of the task, researchers and practitioners have identified numerous critical factors in the effort to improve practice. These issues illustrate that the link between research and practice must be direct; that information in and of itself does not bring about long-term change and that competent technical assistance may be the critical ingredient in implementing innovations. To elaborate further, the literature indicates that schools unquestionably need new approaches and techniques to better meet student learning needs. But knowledge about these approaches is relatively useless unless those who receive it are motivated to find new solutions and have acquired the skills to accomplish the change. Moreover, authors agree that the more fragmented the approach to change, the less chance the innovation has to be incorporated into the system. Similarly the more attention paid to delivering information and the less time spent on acquiring appropriate

new skills, the less likely that the educational practice will survive. The critical factors seem to be: appropriate information that addresses the real and perceived problems of practitioners, acquisition of new personal skills to carry out the implementation, and the availability of skilled technical assistance to deal with the political realities associated with a change effort. Beyond this, one may agree that schools need to adopt "a process, at the heart of which is staff dialogue, by means of which (the school) becomes responsive to its needs and to ways of fulfilling them better." (Goodlad, 1979)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, Gilbert R. "Exemplary Schools and the Search for Effectiveness." Educational Leadership, October, 1979.

Berman, Paul, William McLaughlin and Milbrey Wallin. "Implementation of Educational Innovation." Educational Forum, Vol. 4, N. 3, March, 1976.

Bingham, Richard, et al. Professional Associations as Intermediaries in Transferring Technology to City Governments (Executive Summary). National Science Foundation, August, 1978.

Black, Timothy R. "Ten Institutional Obstacles to Advances in Family Planning." New Concepts in Contraception, (date unknown).

Calsyn, Robert J., et al. "The Appropriateness of Adaptation in the Transfer of Innovations." Evaluation and Change, Vol. 4, 1977.

Chin, Robert. "Basic Strategies and Procedures in Effecting Change." Designing Education for the Future, No. 3, New York: Citation Press, 1967.

Cogen, Morris L. "Educational Innovation: Educational Wasteland." Theory Into Practice, Vol. XV, N. 3, June, 1976.

Downs, George W. and Lawrence Mohr. "Conceptual Issues in the Study of Innovation." Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 21, December, 1976.

Etzioni, Amitai. "Toward a Theory of Guided Societal Change." Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 50, N. 3, December, 1969.

Goodlad, John I. "Educational Change, Values and Goals." Educational Change: The Reality and the Promise, New York: Citation Press, 1966.

_____. The Dynamics of Educational Change. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1975.

Hall, Douglas C. and Susan E. Alford. "Evaluation of the National Diffusion Network: Evolution of the Network and Overview of the Research Literature on Diffusion of Educational Innovations." Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, California, January, 1976.

Havelock, Ronald G. and Mary C. Havelock. Educational Innovation in the United States, Vol. 1. Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, University of Michigan, 1973, (ED 091 865).

Havelock, Ronald G. and A. M. Huberman. Solving Educational Problems: The Theory and Reality of Innovation in Developing Countries. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1978.

Herriott, Robert E. and Neal Gross. "The Complex Nature of Educational Change." The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change, Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1979.

Lipham, James. Change Agentry and School Improvement: The Principal's Role. Paper for Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, November, 1979.

Lippitt, Ronald. "The Use of Social Research to Improve Social Practice." Concepts for Social Change, Washington, D. C.: National Training Laboratories, 1969.

Miles, Matthew B. Networking. New York: Center for Policy Research, January, 1978.

Mogul, Melvin B. "Federal Support for Citizen Participation in Social Action." The Social Welfare Forum, pp. 86-107, 1969.

Orlich, Donald C. "Effecting Needed Changes in Education." Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education, Denver: Publishers Press, Inc., 1967.

Rogers, Everett M. Diffusion of Innovations. New York: Macmillian, 1962.

Rosenblum, Sheila. "The Organizational Change Study: A Conceptualization of Planned Organizational Change." A Multidisciplinary Study of Planned Educational Change, papers delivered at AERA, 1975.

Rubin, Irwin, et al. "Initiating Planned Change in Health Care Systems." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 10, N. 1, 1974.

Scott, Jessie M. "Federal Support for Nursing Education to Improve Quality of Practice." Health Manpower, Vol. 94, N. 1, January-February, 1979.

Volland, Patricia and Pearl S. German. "Development of an Information System: A Means for Improving Social Work Practice in Health Care." American Journal of Public Health, April, 1979.

Yin, Robert K. "Production Efficiency Versus Bureaucratic Self-Interest: Two Innovative Processes?" Policy Sciences, 8, 1977.

_____. Changing Urban Bureaucracies: How New Practices Become Routinized (Executive Summary). Washington, D. C.: Rand Corporation, March, 1978.

Zaltmann, Gerald and Robert Duncan. Strategies for Planned Change. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1977.

Calsyn, Robert J., Louis G. Tarnatzky and Susan Dittmar. "The Appropriateness of Adaptation in the Transfer of Innovations," Evaluation and Change, Volume 4, 1977.

The study conducted by these authors sought to assess the long-term use of a quality but fairly complex innovation used in the mental health field. Despite thorough dissemination practices by the developers of the innovation, the study found that 44 percent of former agency adopters had abandoned its use. Moreover, those who had retained use of the system often adopted it in ways that, the researchers claimed, seriously impaired its effectiveness. As a result, the authors caution that the usefulness and effectiveness of an innovation may be seriously impaired by adaptation to the needs of local settings. Many modifications, they argue, arise out of political expediency and often weaken the innovation rather than strengthen it.

According to the authors, their study of adoption of innovations indicates that fairly complex innovations call for more structured and intensive training and monitoring activities than are usually employed. Printed material and workshops are not very effective means of getting organizations to adopt complex innovations. Instead, intensive action-oriented technical assistance throughout the implementation of the project as well as the organization of a small group of internal agency advocates for the innovation may be more effective means of assuring long-term use of new techniques.

Havelock, Ronald and Mary C. Havelock. Educational Innovation in the United States, Vol. 1. Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, University of Michigan, 1973, (ED 091 865).

Havelock's work describes the nature and frequency of educational innovations occurring in elementary and secondary schools. Conducted in 1970-71, the authors asked school districts to identify the number and types of major innovations occurring in their schools. Major innovation was further described as one that called for a substantial reorientation on the part of staff, a reallocation of resources and the adoption of new practices, programs or technology. Ninety-eight percent of the 353 districts responding reported adopting at least one major innovation during the year. An average of nine innovations per year were adopted by districts employing innovative practices.

The survey also pinpointed the types of innovations that were most frequently introduced. Results noted that the single largest category of innovation was individualized instruction and team teaching. The surveys also indicated that a great deal of focus of innovation was on elementary schools. "Showcase" innovations, those judged by respondents as most significant, involved these target groups listed in order of greatest frequency: underachievers, low socio-economic students, pre first grade and first grade, ethnic minority, dropouts and potential dropouts and students with learning disabilities.

The authors conclude that this study of innovation indicates that change is occurring in our schools and that for most innovations are viewed as a positive and constructive force in the system. Moreover, on the face of it, Havelock notes, many of the innovations are profound rather than trivial, but seldom radical or daring.

Lippitt, Ronald. "The Use of Social Research to Improve Social Practice," Concepts for Social Change. Washington, D. C., National Training Laboratories, 1969.

Lippitt's article describes the models used by social research to improve practice and also discusses the differences between the use of research in the social sciences and the physical and biological sciences. This latter discussion identifies barriers to change in social practice that are considerably more formidable than those encountered in the sciences. Among those Lippitt outlines are that change in social practice more often than not requires changes in values, attitudes and skills of the practitioner. Change in education or mental health, then, is more personally involving than the use of a new seed, or drug. The practitioner in the social fields also receives little feedback about the effectiveness of his/her adoption effort. Consequently there is less real sense of reward for the change efforts and minimal criteria for judging the effectiveness of the new strategy.

Lippitt further concludes that mental health workers and educators are provided with little positive stimulus to risk. Individuals in the field are organized in ways that minimize the competitive challenge and sharing that might contribute to more satisfactory improvement of practice.

Rosenblum, Sheila. "The Organizational Change Study: A Conceptulization of Planned Organizational Change." A Multidisciplinary Study of Planned Educational Change, paper delivered at AERA, 1975.

Unlike many authors who principally advocate the need for planned change in institutions, Rosenblum proposes a number of ways of viewing and understanding the type of change occurring. The author notes that not all change is of equal consequence to an organization. It is important in understanding change and innovation to know how much change is occurring. Is the change, for example, in all units and levels of the organization, does it affect one classroom or all classrooms in the district? Does it impact on basic skills or on other curriculum elements?

A second important question is to determine what aspects of the organization are being changed. Do the changes involve new people, new techniques or a new structure? Are they simple or complex changes and how different is the innovation from what previously existed? By posing these questions, notes the author, the observer of change efforts can move closer to a more critical and thorough understanding of the innovation and the role it plays in the system as a whole.

Educational Equity

The mission of providing for greater educational equity is both more specific and more complex than that of improving the practice of education. It identifies a particular historical problem, more complex because six different group characteristics have been identified as basis for discrimination (race, color, religion, sex, national origin and social class).

Key Points: The importance of the principle of equity is **confirmed** in the writings of those **in virtually all public service fields.**

A consistent philosophy in the definition of the concept of equity is found across fields. In the **translation of the principle into operative systems, an array of strategies is seen.**

"Equal educational opportunity" may be translated into "equal **access** to education" or "equal **results** from education."

Equal opportunity is **not the same for people who are relatively different.**

The Supreme Court ruled the **nature of the violation** (deprival of past opportunity) **determines scope of the remedy.**

Disagreements over equal educational opportunities often arise from **fundamental disagreements over the concept of education** itself; that is, the nature of "desirable" education. Alternative conceptions of education would change the criteria of access and relevant characteristics on which the distribution of education should be based.

Equality of services is extremely difficult to measure:
- Service needs differ from area to area
- Equal inputs can result in different outputs

A **definition acceptable to the courts** is **not the same thing as a definition for educators.**

Equal educational opportunity is **unlikely ever to be perfectly equitable,** but is a **widely acceptable goal of educational policy.**

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The initial paragraph of the authorizing legislation for the National Institute of Education establishes an equity mandate for NIE:

> The Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide to every person an equal opportunity to receive an education of high quality regardless of his race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or social class. . . To achieve quality will require far more dependable knowledge about the processes of learning and education than now exists or can be expected from present research and experimentation in this field. (P. L. 92-318, Section 405)

Timpane translates the legislation into both a general and a special task for NIE: "to improve the quality or practice of education, and specifically to find ways to increase educational equity." (Timpane, 1979)

Timpane suggests that the mission of providing for greater educational equity is both more specific and more complex than that of improving the practice of education. The problem is considered more specific because it identifies a particular historical problem, more complex because six different group characteristics have been identified as bases for discrimination (race, color, religion, sex, national origin and social class), each having its own historical pattern and current status.

The importance of the principle of equity is confirmed in the writings of those in virtually all public service fields; the difficulties of establishing an operational definition of equity and of defining a system which provides equal opportunity are also universally noted. Nevertheless, a demonstrable increase in equity is being sought in various fields.

A large amount of current literature related to issues of equity exists in virtually all fields. As Burbules, Sherman and Lord point out,

"where a discussion of equitable opportunity bears upon education, it is an equally applicable principle in other areas of life--employment, health care, criminal justice, etc." Much of the literature deals primarily with two major aspects of equity: (1) definition of the concept and (2) translation of the concept into operation.

In literature related to equity in the fields of education, law, urban utility services, social sciences and information services, certain philosophical consistency is found in the definition of a concept of equity. In the translation of the principle into operative systems, an array of strategies is seen, although a great deal of overlap exists particularly related to difficulties encountered in establishing equitable delivery systems.

Several patterns for achieving equity (or equal opportunity--which may be seen as one step toward reaching equity) emerge from the review of the literature. Recruitment, judicial intervention, monitoring and use of intermediaries are reported as attempts at alleviating inequity. A fifth strategy, broader in scope, also emerges from the literature: the identification and removal of barriers to equity. Those few studies which make recommendations relevant to equity research suggest this fifth strategy as potentially the most feasible starting point.

Three questions were used to guide this analysis of efforts to define and operationalize the concept of equity:

1. How is equity defined?
2. How is the definition related to the target audiences and the balancing of equity activities among them?
3. How and to what degree is the criterion of equality of access versus equality of results applied in evaluating increases in equity?

Definition of Equity

One of the most current and comprehensive efforts to define the concept of equity in terms of equal educational opportunity was done at The Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance (Center for Educational Research at Stanford) through a grant from the National Institute of Education. In the first of two papers, Nicholas Burbules and Ann Sherman address the question "is equal educational opportunity a worthy ideal, from which we deviate only by error or neglect, or is the principle mistaken in itself, at best misconceived and at worst a tool of ideological control and manipulation?" The force of various criticisms, the authors feel, shows "that while the principle in itself is a worthy ideal, it is inadequate by itself to guarantee a decent education to every person; in other words, the principle constitutes a necessary, but not sufficient, basis for educational policy."

Burbules and Sherman translate "equal educational opportunity" to mean an "equal opportunity for education." The authors suggest that, with this phrasing, the principle can be understood as a distributive principle, concerned with providing access to education. They cite Kamisar and Coombs in the use of the term "equal" to mean "fair" and not, literally, "the same." (Kamisar and Coombs, 1979)

In the same paper, an equal ("equitable") opportunity is considered an opportunity for education and, also, an opportunity which is the same for persons who are relevantly the same, and fair (appropriate) for those who are relevantly different. "An essential feature of opportunity is that it can be ignored, or passed up," state the authors. A consequence of this view is that equality of results cannot be the sole criterion for equity when opportunities are equal. Thus, efforts to achieve

educational equity would emphasize the provision of opportunities for education, through the design of rules of access and compensations, in such a way that, prospectively, one will be able to say, retrospectively, that equal opportunities were provided. "In this respect, the principle of equal educational opportunity is a procedural, and not results oriented, principle." (Burbules and Sherman, 1979)

This is in contrast to the principle laid down by the United States Supreme Court in Brown v. Board of Education: "Such an opportunity (education), where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms." While the courts have never disagreed on the principle of equality, disputes and conflicting holdings continue about what constitutes an infringement of this principle and what are acceptable remedies.

Hooker points out that the search for new definitions of equality of educational opportunity began with Swann v. Charlotte-Mechlenburg Board of Education in 1971. (Hooker, 1979)

In his first school desegregation case, Chief Justice Berger, writing for a unanimous court, stated: "The nature of the violation determines the scope of the remedy." (Millikan v. Bradley) While there was nothing novel in this statement about an equity case, its application in the latest round of Milliken v. Bradley raises the potential for much more litigation and the emergence of new standards to measure equality of educational opportunity. In its latest major pronouncement (1977) the Supreme Court ruled:

> Children who have been thus educationally and culturally set apart from the larger community will inevitably acquire habits of speech, conduct and attitudes, reflecting their cultural isolation. They are likely to acquire speech habits, for example, which vary from the environment in which they must ultimately function and compete, if they are to enter

> and be a part of the community. . . Pupil assignment alone does not automatically remedy the impact of previous, unlawful educational isolation. The consequences linger and can be dealt with only by independent measures. In short, speech habits acquired in a segregated system do not vanish simply by moving the child to a desegregated school. The root condition. . . must be treated directly by special training at the hands of teachers prepared for this task.

As Timpane cautioned, a definition of educational equity which is an acceptable goal for an educator is unlikely to be a definition which a court can enforce. (Timpane, 1979) There are definite limitations on the usefulness--and appropriateness--of judicially-determined policies of equity in education. (Levin, Kutner, Smith and Ennis)

For example, a relatively concrete definition of equal educational opportunity was suggested by James Coleman (1968): equality of average output ("results of schooling") among racial and ethnic groups. Such a definition would suggest that the more intense the external (out of school) influences holding down an ethnic group's achievement, the more intense should be the allocation of educational inputs to that group. (Coleman in Kutner, 1979) Kutner points out that it could also be argued, given such a definition, that educational resources should be allocated in proportion to an individual's learning disabilities (environmental or physiological).

Kutner discusses the judicial implications of both input concepts of equal educational opportunity (such as Coleman's definition) and output concepts. He warns that vigorous enforcement of input concepts "would curtail policies promoting local autonomy and decentralization, confine experimentation, limit opportunities for talented students and excellence in education, and--perhaps most important--hinder concerted attacks upon the most serious educational problems, such as ghetto schools." (Kutner, 1979) He cites several sources (Silard and White, 1970; Wise, 1968; The Evolution of Equal Protection - Education, Municipal Services and Wealth, 1972) in

indicating that output concepts of equal educational opportunity could be criticized as "utopian," as a waste of the abilities of able students as disproportionate resources are allocated to pupils likely to benefit least from them. It is also likely, he reports, that such concepts are incapable of being judicially implemented. (Kutner, 1979)

Paisley, Cirksena and Butler report on equity issues relating to the knowledge base in education and to the distribution of information programs. In doing so, they work toward establishing a policy relevant definition of "information equity." The concept of information equity raises two independent questions: Does the concept incline more toward equal provision of information or equal opportunity to obtain information?

For particular groups with special needs for education information, do necessary improvements in education information programs involve the primary literature (e.g., better research reports, descriptions of practice), databases and secondary information products (e.g., reviews, guides), interpersonal services, points of access or arrangements for feedback (or feedforward)?

Glen Harvey, in Information Equity in the Field of Education: A Conceptual Paper, analyzed information concepts (knowledge, information, information users, information needs, dissemination) and applied them to appropriate equality-equity interpretations to identify possible information equity interpretations for the field of education.

A number of recommendations, which indicate a direction in which information equity policy statements and programs should proceed, evolved from Harvey's extensive conceptual analysis. He cautions that some are not practically completely obtainable, particularly in the immediate

future, but that they can be worked toward. The recommendations are:

1. The use of equity rather than equality be retained and interpreted as meaning fairness. Fairness, in turn, should be interpreted to mean same (equal) treatment/access of equals but differential treatment/access for unequals, determined on the basis of needs.

2. Needs should be interpreted to mean the gap between what is and what should be, focusing on the differences between the information poor and rich. Identification of needs should ultimately include societal, community, personal, or group related needs in the form of long-range, short-range, potential and actual needs.

3. Information should be given a broad interpretation. Within the context of educational information, what this will constitute should be determined on the basis of needs (as expressed by professionals, experts and categories of users).

4. Identification of information needs of potential information users should focus on the following categories:

   - Intermediary User/Ultimate User
   - User Roles
   - Focus Group/Special Needs

5. Production of information should reflect consideration of the needs (and values) of information users.

6. In developing information equity oriented programs and policies, the focus should be on intelligibility, applicability and utilization of information.

7. Terminology associated with information equity should be standardized.

8. Policies and programs should reflect a concern for access, treatment and results. When priorities have been established, results interpretations can potentially provide the best check on the actual effectiveness of program activities.

9. Specific policy recommendations as to which categories of users should be given specific attention, whose needs are to be given priority, what kinds of information should be available, etc., should be developed.

Target Audiences for Equity

In the second of their two papers, Burbules, Sherman and Lord seek to clarify that a potential basis for disputes over "equitable opportunities

for education" is in the concept of education itself. The authors cite Robert Ennis in drawing attention to the fact that disagreements over equal educational opportunities often arise from fundamental disagreements over the nature of desirable education, especially in view of the fact that persons may not desire or require the same education. (Ennis, 1979) Burbules, Sherman and Lord suggest that alternative conceptions of education would, on the one hand, change the criteria of access, due to varying conditions of access in the educational setting, and on the other hand, change the determination of relevant characteristics on which the distribution of that education should be based.

According to Paisley, Cirksena and Butler, the difference between equal provision of information and equal opportunity to obtain information comes to focus in the policy decision to be proactive and reactive with respect to use patterns.

Recent studies, they report, indicate that in many parts of the country most educators have approximately equal opportunity to obtain information. However, Paisley, Cirksena and Butler caution that these programs do not achieve equal provision of information, because large numbers of educators exclude themselves from the user group, some for the reason that they lack motivation or readiness (in the sense of communication competence) to make professional use of information. It is the existence of a group which does not or cannot use information that makes the question of a proactive or reactive policy important. Should they be reached, even at considerable cost and effort, on the grounds that they too affect students' outcomes and they too have a professional responsibility to stay abreast of developments in education?

The authors state that many groups with special needs do not pose this policy dilemma, because they do not yet have equal opportunity to

obtain information. Lack of equal opportunity is most readily acknowledged in the case of persons with physical handicaps affecting access to information resources, those with sensory handicaps affecting ability to process information resources, and in the case of students and the public. However, the concept of equal opportunity should be defined richly enough to identify barriers, invisible but real, that make it more difficult in some cases for minorities, women, older people and others to be regular and effective users even of nearby programs. The authors point out that forming a strategy for information seeking, carrying out the strategy through contacts with information programs, securing and processing the information, and making use of new knowledge or skills are a sequence of acts that must be learned, practiced, rewarded and practiced again. This user behavior is taken for granted by information programs--yet, for various reasons, many people do not approach either their lives or their professions in quite this way--although they may welcome new ideas or practices that they can learn about in other ways. (Paisley, Butler, Cirksena, 1979)

"Keyes v. School District Number One: A Constitutional Right to Equal Educational Opportunity" (Kutner, 1979) traces the progress of attempts to establish a judicial definition of "equal educational opportunity" through the decisions of landmark cases. Kutner reports that "a cautious, case-by-case definition of what equality was <u>not</u> was more likely than attempts to define and enforce a positive definition of equal educational opportunity to rest upon a firm legal and empirical basis. Courts could not order reductions in achievement disparities, but they could attack flaws in school administration which prevented students from approaching nearer their potential achievement levels." Courts could act against

financial disparities which affected educational enrichment and achievement and, in addition, courts could prod school authorities into greater attention to alleviating disabilities in learning.

Further insight into the interaction of the judiciary and education regarding equality of educational opportunity is provided by Betsy Levin in "The Courts as Educational Policymakers and Their Impact on Federal Programs." (Rand Corporation, 1977) This monograph discusses some restrictions that the courts have imposed on how federal legislation, aided by executive resolutions, can address various educational issues.

Levin's analysis led her to conclude that courts must address specific inequities, but that the judicial branch is most certainly not the only federal institution which can seek educational equity. If Congress enacts programs to aid certain groups who are confronted with barriers to equal educational opportunity, then Congress will be working with the courts to establish greater educational equity. In addition, Congress can enact programs which provide incentives to states to correct inequities; current federal programs that may be undercutting states' attempts to correct inequities can be adjusted.

In "Equity and Institutional Design in Urban Service Delivery," Richard C. Rich discusses the issue of equitable provision of public services. He draws upon writings of various authors in indicating areas of difficulty which are found in the defining of "an equitable division of services," particularly in the existing situation of diverse and changing needs.

First, since service needs differ significantly from area to area, provision of equal services to unequal areas can result in severe inequities. Provision of identical services in two neighborhoods can hardly be considered equitable if the residents of one area deeply desire

the service, while those of the other feel no need for it and would prefer to see an allocation of funds to other services. (Rich, 1977)

Second, equal inputs can result in different outputs in separate areas. The relationship between the dollar value of inputs and the actual level of services provided depends on a variety of factors which may be neighborhood specific.

As part of their extensive review of literature on information needs of the disadvantaged, Childers and Post surveyed the provision of welfare services. They cite Alfred Kahn, from his classic study of information and referral processes related to social services, in describing the current situation: "There is evidence that users of the entire social welfare network are less adequately served because of defects at the 'doorway' and in information services. (Kahn in Childers and Post, 1975)

The disadvantaged individual in need of welfare assistance is faced with a maze of agencies, each dispensing a variety of social services or benefits. Childers and Post suggest that the bewildering complexity of the welfare system itself, the uncoordinated mass of activities which "has evolved apparently without plan and seems to do nothing so well as confuse the needy and keep him from his rightful benefits" is actually the major barrier to information services in welfare. They report that some welfare agencies--notably the Social Security Administration--recognize the situation and are attempting to rectify it by adopting referral or switching activities to help get clients to the proper social agencies. Although some studies indicate that this use of intermediary referral agencies seems feasible, activities have been adopted by agencies reluctantly and, thus, the study reports

that the dissemination of information among the various welfare programs and from programs to potential clients remains chaotic and complex. (Childers and Post, 1975)

A recommendation for the use of intermediaries in the form of a system of neighborhood units ("neighborhood level instrumentalities empowered to provide services directly") is made by Richard C. Rich as a strategy for overcoming the problem of equity in public services delivery. (Rich, 1977) He suggests that such an approach would facilitate a more equitable distribution of public services without requiring recourse to judicial intervention or high levels of political participation on the part of clients.

In the proposed plan, services would be divided into categories of local and areawide, to be supplied through the neighborhood and metropolitan units, respectively. Rich suggests that the greatest strength of this arrangement relates to its potential impact on the responsiveness of municipal service delivery as it would provide local residents with greater capacity for satisfying their diverse service needs and preferences. (Rich, 1979)

Rich states that the concept of neighborhood based service delivery he presents is very broad and would require a variety of institutional arrangements consistent with its goals. The proposed system would involve a set of concurrent jurisdictions serving different geographic arrangements--a multitiered governmental configuration. Because of this, complex interorganizational relations would have to be worked out to provide coordination and to resolve interjurisdictional conflicts. However, since a broader range of groups would have institutional representation under the proposed system, Rich feels there is value in such a system in

that more diverse interests are likely to be taken into account and that a more equitable distribution of policy outcomes would be possible. (Rich, 1977)

Evaluation of Equity Activities

Equality of services is extremely difficult to measure. There is an initial problem of selecting appropriate units of analysis. Urban neighborhoods, for example, are difficult to define geographically and, moreover, overlapping patterns of service preferences will exist with reference to different services. Even if "neighborhoods" can be defined, it is difficult to find measures which adequately reflect the quality of services they are receiving. Exclusive use of input measures can grossly distort relationships, and adequate measures of outputs are expensive to obtain. (Ostrom, 1973)

Rich cites R. L. Lineberry in pointing out that "equitable service delivery cannot usefully be equated with provision of equal (identical) services." (Lineberry, 1974)

Kutner suggests that "output" theories of equal educational opportunity (such as found in the Keyes decision) were not wholly untenable and that "there was a substantial legal foundation for judicial control of disparate educational 'inputs.'" (Kutner, 1979) It is his belief that from the Keyes case has evolved a foundation upon which a constitutional doctrine of equal educational opportunity could be established.

However, there is yet no legal definition for determining when equality of educational opportunity has been achieved. "A right to equal educational opportunity was a promise held out by the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment. The district court in Keyes v. School

District Number One, no less than the Court of Appeals and Supreme Court, left it substantially unrealized." (Kutner, 1979)

Timpane addresses the considerable experience the National Institute of Education has already had with the difficulties of establishing a definition of educational equity to guide both program planning and evaluation of results. He cites a paper prepared for the Reorganization Task Force (1977) in noting that: "a definition acceptable to the courts is not the same thing as a definition for educators. 'An educational program suitable to the needs and aspirations of each individual' is a perfectly acceptable goal for an educator, but not a definition which a court can enforce." (Timpane, 1979)

Timpane goes on to suggest that "a precise and necessarily restricting definition of equity" may not be either appropriate or useful for an agency such as the National Institute of Education. He indicates that "equity research" is a quest for the agency; a quest which involves a search for an understanding of barriers to educational equity and for the means by which the inequities can be ended.

Burbules, Sherman and Lord, in their comprehensive examination of the principle of equal educational opportunity, caution that it is unlikely that opportunities will ever be perfectly equitable, but, "whether ideally possible or not, the principle of equitable opportunity is a widely acceptable goal of educational policy, to be aimed at, if not achieved." They point out that the principle is indeterminate with regard to a broad range of educational and social outcomes and urge that equitable opportunity therefore be considered a necessary, but not sufficient, basis for educational policy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burbules, Nicholas C. and Ann L. Sherman. Equal Educational Opportunity: Ideal or Ideology? (Program Report No. 79-B17), May, 1979.

Burbules, Nicholas C., Ann L. Sherman and Brian Lord. Equity, Equal Opportunity and Education. (Project Report No. 79-A4), Center for Educational Research, Stanford University, September, 1979.

Childers, Thomas and Joyce Post. The Information-Poor in America. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1975.

Coleman, James. "The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity." Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 38, 1968.

Ennis, R. "Equality of Educational Opportunity." Educational Theory, Vol. 26, No. 1, 1979.

Feldbaum, Eleanor G. "Integration Strategies for the Nursing Profession." Maryland University: Program of Health Services Delivery (DHEW/PHS), 1978.

Fong, Kevin M. "Cultural Pluralism." Harvard Civil Rights - Civil Liberties Law Review, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 133-173, winter, 1978.

Gold, Milton, Carl Grant and Harry Rivlin (eds.) In Praise of Diversity: A Resource Book for Multicultural Education, Teacher Corps, Association of Teacher Educators: Washington, D. C., 1977.

Harvey, Glen. Information Equity in the Field of Education: A Conceptual Paper. Far West Laboratory, November, 1979.

Henkin, Louis. "Constitutional Rights and Human Rights." (Third Francis Biddle Memorial Lecture, Harvard Law School, April 6, 1978), Harvard Civil Rights - Civil Liberties Law Review, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 593-632, summer, 1978.

Hooker, Clifford P. "Legal Issues in Desegregation Litigation." NOLPE School Law Journal, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1979.

Kamisar, B. Paul and Jerrold R. Coombs. "The Concept of Equality in Education." Studies in Philosophy and Education, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1979.

Kutner, Peter B. "Keyes v. School District Number One: A Constitutional Right to Equal Educational Opportunity?" Journal of Law and Education, Vol. 8, No. 1, January, 1979.

Levin, Betsy. "The Courts as Educational Policymakers and their Impact on Federal Programs." Rand Corporation, August, 1977.

Lineberry, R. L. "Mandating Urban Equality: The Distribution of Municipal Public Services." Texas Law Review, 43:20-58, 1974.

National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs. To Provide Educational Equity for Women. Third Annual Report, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1977.

_____. Educational Equity: The Continuing Challenge. Fourth Annual Report, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1978.

Ostrom, E. "The Need for Multiple Indicators in Measuring the Output of Public Agencies." Policy Studies Journal, summer, 1973.

Paisley, William, Mary Kathryn Cirksena and Matilda Butler. Conceptualization of Information Equity Issues in Education. (Education Dissemination System Support Program) Far West Laboratory, San Francisco, California, February, 1979.

Rich, Richard C. "Equity and Institutional Design in Urban Service Delivery." Urban Affairs Quarterly, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 383-405, March, 1977.

_____ and P. M. Gregg. "Neighborhood Organization in Urban Administration." Paper prepared for the 36th National Conference on Public Administration, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1975.

Schmuck, Patricia. The Sex Dimension and School Organizations. Chapter 3: "Overview and Synthesis," (work in progress, 1980).

Timpane, Michael. "Equity as a Guiding Theme for NIE." Review discussion paper to National Council on Educational Research, June, 1979.

Watson, Bernard C. "Stupidity, Sloth and Public Policy: Social Darwinism Rides Again." National Urban Coalition, Washington, D. C., May, 1973.

Women's Equity Action League. "The National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities - - - and Equal Opportunity for Women." Ford Foundation, New York, August, 1978.

Burbules, Nicholas C. and Ann L. Sherman. Equal Educational Opportunity: Ideal or Ideology? Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University, May, 1979.

The thesis of this monograph is that the principle of equal educational opportunity is inadequate in that it cannot: (1) guarantee a decent education for every person in society, (2) guarantee a just distribution of educational and social outcomes, (3) provide a normative foundation for all the things educational institutions are expected to do.

The dominant interpretations of the principle of equal educational opportunity are reviewed in the paper and major criticisms of each of those interpretations are reviewed and analyzed extensively.

The conclusion drawn by the authors is that the principle of equal educational opportunity should be viewed as necessary, but not sufficient, for the just distribution of the benefits of education. The authors suggest that "the principle in itself is a worthy ideal, but by itself, it stands as a limited and counterproductive ideology." Suggestions are made as to what other principles might be included with the principle of equal educational opportunity in order to make it necessary and sufficient.

Burbules, Nicholas C., Ann L. Sherman and Brian Lord. Equity, Equal Opportunity, and Education. Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, Stanford University, September, 1979.

In this second in a series of monographs,* an extended analysis of the concept of "equal opportunity" and its relationship to equity, justice and educational policy is presented.

The authors suggest that no single concept of equal opportunity exists; that there are several alternative conceptions which can, however, be discussed and compared within a basic framework and terminology. The importance of a clear conception of "education" in understanding "equal educational opportunity" is stressed.

Because equal opportunity (as a procedural principle of justice) is seen as indeterminate with regard to a range of educational and social outcomes, the authors conclude that it must be supplemented by other normative principles and criteria.

*See: Burbules and Sherman. Equal Educational Opportunity: Ideal or Ideology? Stanford University, May, 1979.

Childers, Thomas and Joyce Post. The Information Poor in America. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1975.

The Information Poor in America is the final report of a study entitled "Knowledge/Information Needs of the Disadvantaged" (Bureau of Libraries and Learning Resources, USOE). The study was conceived as a review of various literatures with the intent being to produce a digest and bibliography which would help establish direction for later research service.

The review of studies on information needs indicated that all people in this society need essentially the same kind of information to survive, but that the "disadvantaged individual needs large remedial doses of information" in order to be on the same information level of society.

Areas of information need assessed in this study included: health, consumer affairs, housing, home and family, employment, welfare, law, the political process, transportation, recreation and education.

In relation to education, the study was limited to material on how information about educational programs is sought, how that information is used, and what additional information might be needed. Although literature with this focus was found to be sparse, the study found that there exists a need to inform individuals about available educational opportunities: their nature, prerequisites, eligibility requirements, particulars of the program (hours, facilities, requirements, transportation), and rewards (applicability of learned skills, certificates, diplomas, job placement services, etc.).

Recommendations are made for strengthening future research and demonstration efforts so that a better understanding of--and response to--the information needs of disadvantaged Americans can be made.

Harvey, Glen. Information Equity in the Field of Education: A Concept Paper. Far West Laboratory, November, 1979.

The overall purpose of this paper is the provision of the conceptual clarification of information equity so that it can become a meaningful and useful concept upon which to base information oriented policies, programs, research projects and service efforts.

There are three major sections in the paper. The purpose of the first section is the clarification of the concepts of equality and equity.

In the second section information related concepts (knowledge, information, information users, information needs, dissemination and utilization) are analyzed and applied to appropriate equality-equity interpretations. The purpose of this analysis is clarification of the concept of information equity.

The third section illustrates possible educational programs and policies which are representative of different interpretations of information equity. Potential problems with each are analyzed.

A fourth section lists policy recommendations related to information equity.

A comprehensive list of references is included with the paper.

Kutner, Peter B. "Keyes v. School District Number One: A Constitutional Right to Equal Educational Opportunity?" Journal of Law and Education, Vol. 8, No. 1, January, 1979.

This article examines the concept of "equal educational opportunity" found in the district court's decision in the Keyes case and in the Court of Appeal's response. The legal framework in which those decisions were made, and the historical evolution of significant cases which established that framework, are analyzed.

Kutner points out that, in the century preceding Keyes v. School District Number One, an approach centered on input disparaties improved the quality of education available to racial minorities but did not establish a right to equal educational opportunity.

A right to equal educational opportunity was a promise held out by the fourteenth amendment in its equal protection clause but, according to Kutner, court decisions have as yet left it substantially unrealized.